

BUILDING A WORLD OF FREE PEOPLES

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
AT
KANSAS CITY, MO.

APRIL 29, 1957

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1957

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois, *Chairman*

THOMAS E MORGAN, Pennsylvania	ROBERT B CHIPERFIELD, Illinois
A S J. CARNAHAN, Missouri	JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin	FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio
OMAR BURLESON, Texas	LAWRENCE H SMITH, Wisconsin
BROOKS HAYS, Arkansas	CHESTER E MERROW, New Hampshire
EDNA F. KELLY, New York	WALTER H JUDD, Minnesota
WAYNE L HAYS, Ohio	JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania
ROBERT C BYRD, West Virginia	DONALD L JACKSON, California
ARMISTEAD I SELDEN, Jr., Alabama	KARL M LECOMPTE, Iowa
J L. PILCHER, Georgia	EDMUND P RADWAN, New York
BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois	ALBERT P MORANO, Connecticut
L H FOUNTAIN, North Carolina	MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Illinois
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida	E ROSS ADAIR, Indiana
FRANK M COFFIN, Maine	WINSTON L PROUTY, Vermont
LEONARD FARBSTINE, New York	ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Michigan
D. S SAUND, California	

BOYD CRAWFORD, *Staff Administrator*
 ROY J. BULLOCK, *Staff Consultant*
 ALBERT C F. WESTPHAL, *Staff Consultant*
 SHELDON Z KAPLAN, *Staff Consultant*
 DUMOND PECK HILL, *Staff Consultant*
 JUNE NIGH, *Staff Assistant*
 WINIFRED G. OSBORNE, *Staff Assistant*
 HELEN C MATTAS, *Staff Assistant*
 MYRTIE MELVIN, *Staff Assistant*
 HELEN L HASHAGEN, *Staff Assistant*
 MARY LOUISE O'BRIEN, *Staff Assistant*
 ROBERT J BOWEN, *Clerical Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS

To deal with questions relating to the United Nations and its specialized agencies, other present and proposed international organizations, and the development of international law, and those aspects of communism, fascism, nationalism, and other political ideas basically affecting international relations.

A S. J. CARNAHAN, Missouri, *Chairman*

L H FOUNTAIN, North Carolina	CHESTER E MERROW, New Hampshire
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida	WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota
FRANK. M COFFIN, Maine	KARL M LECOMPTE, Iowa

ROY J. BULLOCK, *Staff Consultant*
 HELEN L HASHAGEN, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

	Page
Barker, Hon. John T., speaker, Missouri House of Representatives, Kansas City, Mo.....	259
Berkley, Eliot S., executive director, International Relations Council, Kansas City, Mo.....	302
Bowker, Mrs. Betrenia, Kansas City, Mo. (International relations chairman, Kansas City branch of the American Association of University Women.).....	281
Bragg, Dr. Raymond B., chairman of the Kansas City Chapter of the American-Christian-Palestine Committee, Kansas City, Mo.....	243
Cockrell, Ewing, president, United States Federation of Justice, and special commissioner, Missouri Supreme Court; Warrensburg, Mo.....	305
Davis, Mrs. Dwight, president, Kansas City League of Women Voters, Kansas City, Mo.....	248
Demaree, Mrs. Ophelia, Kansas City, Mo.....	309
Lyne, Mrs. Thomas, League of Women Voters of Shawnee Mission, Prairie Village, Kans.....	290
McCormick, Thurman L., attorney and chairman, congress of Freedom, Inc. Kansas City, Mo.....	317
Milliken, Mrs. Gladys K., Kansas City, Mo.....	311
Potter, William I., attorney, Kansas City, Mo.....	293
Price, Mrs. Guy V., Kansas City, Mo.....	300
Sheskin, Harry, attorney, regional president, Zionist Organization of America; chairman, Zionist Council of Greater Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo.....	276
Stuber, Dr. Stanley I., general secretary, Council of Churches of Greater Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo.....	284
Taylor, Rev. Thurston, Board of Christian Social Relations of the Southwest Missouri Conference of the Methodist Church, Kansas City, Mo.....	253
Truman, Hon. Harry S., former President of the United States, Independence, Mo.....	265
Wasserstrom, Mrs. Solbert M., participant and representative of the American Association of University Women in an informal referendum, Kansas City, Mo.....	313

STATEMENTS AND LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Amick, James E., C. L. U., Kansas City, Mo.....	323
Dowgray, Dr. John G. L., Jr., on behalf of the participants in the study-discussion group, World Affairs Are Your Affairs, sponsored by the Continuing Education Center, the University of Kansas City, evening division, Kansas City, Mo.....	323
Hunt, William P., Lincoln, Nebr.....	324
Turner, Robert L., Bethel, Kans.....	326
Uhlmann, Mrs. Selma C., Kansas City, Mo.....	326
Wynant, R. E., Kansas City, Mo.....	327

BUILDING A WORLD OF FREE PEOPLES

MONDAY, APRIL 29, 1957

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS,
Kansas City, Mo.

The subcommittee met at 9 a. m., in the Jackson County Court House, Hon. A. S. J. Carnahan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present, in addition to Representative Carnahan, of Missouri, chairman of the subcommittee: Representative L. H. Fountain of North Carolina, Representative Chester E. Merrow of New Hampshire and Representative Karl M. LeCompte of Iowa, members of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements; also Representative Brooks Hays of Arkansas and Representative D. S. Saund of California, members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Representative George H. Christopher, a Member of Congress from Missouri.

MR. CARNAHAN. The committee will come to order.

This is a Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives. We are in Kansas City this morning to hear witnesses from this section in connection with foreign policy, and we are particularly interested in the mutual security program or the foreign aid program.

I will not take further time but will get immediately into the hearing of the witnesses.

Our first witness this morning is Dr. Raymond Bragg.

Dr. Bragg.

For the record, if you do not have it in your prepared statement, would you give us a very brief statement of your personal background?

STATEMENT OF DR. RAYMOND B. BRAGG, CHAIRMAN OF THE KANSAS CITY CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN- PALESTINE COMMITTEE, KANSAS CITY, MO.

DR. BRAGG. I am presently the minister of All Souls Unitarian Church in Kansas City. I was educated at Brown University and the University of Chicago, two foreign universities, both German. I have been the executive director of the Unitarian Service Committee which carries on a humanitarian service program across the world. I am speaking in this instance as the chairman of the Kansas City Chapter of the American Christian-Palestine Committee.

Mr. CARNAHAN. You may proceed.

Dr. BRAGG. The peoples of the Near East—Moslem, Jew and Christian—remain in urgent need of social and economic assistance. Dire problems of health, food, and housing are no respecters of boundaries, and their solution must likewise transcend national jealousies and political disputes. Vitally needed regional cooperation in combating the age-old enemies, poverty, ignorance and disease, goes by default.

In the Near East the American people view an area in tumult. Internal tensions combined with government instability and economic discontent prepare the victory for international communism without a single shot having to be fired by the Soviet Union.

The Eisenhower doctrine affords a shield against international communism. It is designed, however, to meet only the ultimate emergency, and at a point and a time when the cost for the American people may well be enormous. A policy of "too much, too late" is ruinous when a comparative little now might secure us against untold future sacrifices.

WITH RESPECT TO THE THREAT FROM INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

In order that the Near East may be most effectively protected against the immediate threat from international communism and so that the American people may be relieved of the burden of unilateral responsibility for this effort, the free world must be a united one and share in the challenging tasks of bringing hope and freedom to the area. The power and prestige of Great Britain and France are still considerable, in the Near East as well as in other areas of the world.

It is therefore recommended that the United States Government:

First, work toward restoring to their former vigor traditional measures of cooperation in the Near East with Great Britain, France, and other Western allies, sharing with them the task of defending the Near East against Soviet aggression;

Second, anchor its defense strategy in the Near East to positions of genuine strength in the area, these being principally Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, and possibly Iraq, who alone have so far shown both the determination and the capacity to preserve their national heritage. At a later stage, when other Arab States have demonstrated a similar determination and capacity, these may also be included in area defense plans.

WITH RESPECT TO THE ARAB-ISRAEL CONFLICT

Of equal immediate significance in strengthening the Near East's defenses is the resolution of the outstanding tensions of the area. Paramount among these tensions is the Arab-Israel conflict, whose division impact continues to frustrate the fulfillment of United States policy objectives in the Near East. Here only the most resolute leadership by the Administration will succeed in bringing to a halt the hostile pressures which the Arab states are directing against Israel in both the United Nations and Near East. Only direct Arab-Israeli negotiations can lay the groundwork for a permanent settlement of outstanding issues.

The United States should not discriminate as between Israel and Egypt with respect to their obligations to the United Nations and to

each other. Egypt must be required to accept the principles of free navigation and nonbelligerency, in accordance with the Security Council decision of 1951.

There should be no double standard in international morality for the United States. Any other course should be unthinkable for this Government. Indeed, our energies should be directed rather at opening the door to negotiations between Egypt and Israel.

It is therefore recommended that the United States Government:

First, strive both within and outside the United Nations for mutual compliance by Israel and Egypt with their obligations to the United Nations and to each other.

Second, support without further delay the beginning of direct peace negotiations between the Arab states and Israel.

Third, grant unequivocal and immediate assurance to Israel and all other nations that their right of innocent passage through the Gulf of Aqaba will be protected.

Fourth, once the guaranty on Aqaba has been given, urge an effective United Nations military occupation of the Gaza strip until the future of the area has been settled by negotiation between Israel and Egypt.

Fifth, secure the freedom of access by all nations, including Israel, to the Suez Canal.

WITH RESPECT TO NEAR EAST SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Over a period of time the peoples of the Near East will have their independence best assured, as well as their well-being most fruitfully advanced, through the economic and social development of the region. In recognition, therefore, of the need for an affirmative and constructive program which will capture the imagination of the nations of the Near East,

Be it further recommended that the United States Government—

First, make available, both unilaterally and through the United Nations, the economic aid and technical assistance needed to overcome the scourges of ignorance, poverty and disease endured now with increasing impatience by the peoples of the area.

Second, base such assistance wherever possible on the principle of regional cooperation, whereby assistance is rendered to such large scale projects as the Jordan River plan, the Tigris-Euphrates development, the "master plan" for the Nile River and whereby the cooperative efforts of all peoples of the region will be of equal benefit to all.

MR. CARNAHAN. Dr. Bragg, we appreciate your coming before the committee and sharing with us your experiences.

I suggested to the members of the committee that we allow approximately 15 minutes to each witness. We have quite a few witnesses today, and we will go around with the questioning as far as we can get within the 15-minute period. If we don't get all the way around, we will take up where we left off with the next witness.

Dr. Bragg, in your statement you say that we could perhaps spend comparatively little now which might secure us against untold future sacrifices. Would you care to elaborate just a little further on that?

DR. BRAGG. I think that our group was very apprehensive as to the possibility of a World War being generated in the present conflicts of the Near East, and that any investment of treasure in the Middle

East short of a third world war would be insurance rather than an expenditure in the ordinary sense.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Bragg, in your recommendations on page 3 you suggest that we make available, both unilaterally and through the United Nations, the economic aid and technical assistance needed to overcome the scourges of ignorance, poverty, and disease endured now with increasing impatience by the peoples of the area. You feel, then, that our policy of mutual aid should be continued?

Dr. BRAGG. I feel it deeply, sir.

Mr. MERROW. And do you feel that it should be increased, if necessary? How do you feel about the amount?

Dr. BRAGG. Well, I am not prepared to talk in specific figures, but I am convinced that the present wave of enthusiasm for cutting back foreign aid is fraught with dangers unmentionable, and I go back to my earlier position. I think that we as a people at the present moment are thinking too much in terms of whether we want to do it or we don't want to do it. I think that the situation is such that we've got to extend ourselves as a people to reach into the situation that exists in the Middle East, even at a sacrifice beyond any that we have made up to this hour.

Mr. MERROW. Do you feel that we should engage in a long-range economic program over several years?

Dr. BRAGG. I do.

Mr. MERROW. And development?

Dr. BRAGG. I do.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Dr. Bragg, you have made some very interesting and excellent recommendations, I would like to hear you discuss some of them in more detail. I have in mind in particular the third one in which you say:

grant unequivocal and immediate assurance to Israel and all other nations that their right of innocent passage through the Gulf of Aqaba will be protected.

Dr. BRAGG. I am personally convinced that the Aqaba situation can in a matter of weeks develop in this way, that an Israeli ship on an innocent passage will come down to the straits, she will be fired upon, and in turn the Israelis will send an air cover and perhaps 2 or 3 destroyers and a fight is on. In other words, I think we can be drawn into a struggle that we might prevent by a firm policy. I have profound respect for the difficulties of carrying out a foreign policy in this troubled world, but I must say that our State Department, as I hear the voices that come out of it, have not been clear-minded or clear-spoken about the extent of the danger and what we were willing to do to stand between that danger and the future, so that I would like to see or I'd like to hear uncompromising statements to the effect we have defined Aqaba as an international waterway and that we intend to see to it that it is sustained as an international waterway.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. And you would be willing to make such a firm statement and back it up by force, if necessary?

Dr. BRAGG. I would.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. You think we ought to let them know that we will use force if we think it necessary, in order to avoid any misunderstanding about our position?

Dr. BRAGG. I think so.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Then, you are definitely opposed to any form of appeasement?

Dr. BRAGG. I am opposed to appeasement. I lived in Europe in the period of appeasement, and I have not recovered from the haunting bitterness of that time.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. That is all. Thank you very much.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr LeCompte.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Dr. Bragg, you have made some very interesting comments and statements. I was particularly interested in your recommendation that we make available, both unilaterally and through the United Nations, the economic aid and technical assistance needed to overcome the scourges of ignorance, poverty, and disease throughout the world. Do you have any figures on what it might cost to remove all poverty?

Dr. BRAGG. No. This difficulty I see clearly. It seems to me, however, that many of the problems presented in the Middle East today are presented by peoples who are trying to make their way into the 20th century. It seems to me further that we bear a responsibility for a more orderly development. What is the direction? To simply say that the problem is overwhelming, staggering, and everyone would have to agree with those adjectives, but still to say that there is nothing that can be done—the problem in 1945 on the Continent of Europe was staggering and overwhelming, and yet one who has seen Europe in the last several months would realize that overwhelming and staggering problems can be dealt with.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In the last paragraph you express endorsement of all such projects as the Jordan River and the Tigris-Euphrates. Of course, projects in this country, you know, have to be first authorized by Congress and then afterward an appropriation has to be made for each separate project, but you would allow or you would authorize International Cooperation Administration to go forward with these projects without reference to Congress?

Dr. BRAGG. Well, Congress ultimately would bear the burden of appropriations, wouldn't it?

Mr LECOMPTE. Well, Congress has been appropriating a lump sum for mutual security and a few years ago an announcement was made in Congress that we were going to help build the Aswan Dam, but no one had heard of it in Congress and then the statement was made that the whole project was withdrawn, and still that was without reference to Congress.

Dr. BRAGG. The organization and order by which these goals are approached is a problem in government and the citizen needs instruction

Mr LECOMPTE. We were told that—my interpretation—the International Cooperation Administration had the authority for those projects but they never were specifically voted on in Congress.

Dr. BRAGG. I would make this response, that there have been a number of difficulties, that there have been difficulties, abuses, that the achievement of this Nation in the last several years in establishing the currents of life in many parts of the world is almost a dream in

retrospect and I think there is resourcefulness left in the institutions of the United States to continue that trend and impoverish neither the Government or its people

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Congressman Hays, we will allow you time for one question and then we are going to have to pass to the next witness.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Dr. Bragg, one short question. I was interested in what you said about policing the Gaza strip. Do you personally favor a permanent United Nations police force and if you do, would that reflect the views of your group?

Dr. BRAGG. I don't believe we have ever considered this and I wouldn't know what to say. We had to create an emergency force under given circumstances. It would seem to me personally a pity to disperse a force so gathered. I don't believe that our group as a group has ever given any consideration to it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Do you think it was good to have a U. N. force in the area?

Dr. BRAGG. I think without it—it was a stroke of genius to create it.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund, we will give you one question.

Mr. SAUND. You talk about this cooperation between England and France. Did you approve the action of England and France to use force in order to bring Nasser to his senses?

Dr. BRAGG. I did not, nor did I approve the attack of Israel. On the other hand, I must concede to myself and to others that the provocation was substantial and that under similar circumstances I think the United States would have probably moved.

Mr. SAUND. You say you didn't approve the use of force by England and France in the Israeli crisis?

Dr. BRAGG. I would ask whether you are directing to me an ethical question or a political question.

Mr. SAUND. A political question, which we are discussing, and ethics. Did you approve or did you not approve?

Dr. BRAGG. I did not approve the attack of France and Britain.

Mr. SAUND. I have only the one question.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Dr. Bragg.

Dr. BRAGG. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Next we will call Mrs. Dwight Davis.

Mrs. Davis, would you give us a brief statement of personal background for the record before you begin the presentation of your statement?

STATEMENT OF MRS. DWIGHT DAVIS, PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mrs. DAVIS. I would be glad to.

Mr. Carnahan and members of the panel, I am Mrs. Dwight Davis and I am president of the Kansas City League of Women Voters. I have been a member some 18 years, and I bring to you, then, in this statement, the thinking of our group.

May I read it?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yes.

Mrs. DAVIS. The League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan organization, promotes political responsibility through informed and active participation of citizens in government. The League carries out this purpose through its program and voters' service.

The program consists of the governmental measures and policies on which the League may take action. The platform—or continuing responsibilities—shall consist of (1) governmental principles supported by the League as a whole and (2) positions on national issues to which the League has given sustained attention and on which it may continue to take action. With regard to international relations these principles are cited:

Principle 18. Development of international organization and international law to achieve permanent means of cooperation

Principle 17: Cooperation with other nations in solving international problems

All League action in the international field is based on the premise that the nations and the peoples of the modern world are interdependent and that our national security and prosperity depend on cooperation with other nations. Acceptance of these principles developed through years of study of the causes of wars and participation by League members in the heated controversies over foreign policy which followed both World Wars.

As early as 1923 the League took the stand that isolation was neither possible nor desirable for the United States and that citizens should unite without regard to party affiliation in support of every constructive effort toward permanent world organization for peace.

One of the most intensive nationwide efforts ever undertaken by the league came at the time of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for the establishment of the United Nations. The League has continuously supported the principle of the Charter of the United Nations as the most comprehensive system for international cooperation that the world has yet been able to achieve, and that its full potentialities for effectiveness are not yet fully understood or used. The League has repeatedly advocated action by the United States Government toward fulfilling the major security provisions of the Charter through the provision of armed forces to the U. N., regulation of armaments, and international control of atomic energy and other weapons of mass destruction. However, regional organization has also been supported as a step toward a more universal security system.

Economic advancement in the underdeveloped countries was emphasized by the League from 1950 to 1954 as a primary necessity for world economic stability and to strengthen the economic and military defenses of the nations of the free world. The League supported the United States program for assistance to underdeveloped countries as essential both to world security and to the expansion of world trade. Since 1951 the League has strongly supported United States participation in the expanded technical assistance program of the United Nations and sees in this multilateral approach a means of allaying the fear of United States imperialism which has at times been a handicap to United States technical assistance projects. And this statement I would underline. We view these programs as a profoundly important element in our foreign policy because we see in them the best means available for contributing to the evolution of the newly emerging states, as Asia, Africa, and other areas, into the kind of reliable partners we must have for successful cooperation in conducting the business of an interdependent world.

Principle 16: Domestic policies which facilitate the solution of international problems

The League repeatedly reaffirmed its stand for a downward revision of tariffs through reciprocal trade agreements. The League advocates a tariff policy based on the general public interest, not on special sectional or group interests. Since 1928 every League program has contained an item concerning international cooperation in the economic field.

We respectfully submit this statement to you, we, the League of Women Voters of Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mrs. Davis, we appreciate this statement, and we are glad you brought to the committee the thinking of your group.

Have you discussed or given thought to whether or not military aid to foreign countries should be separated from economic and technical assistance?

Mrs. DAVIS. We have been concerned, certainly, with the unbalance of the amounts spent in the two fields, feeling sincerely that economic aid is of vital importance in this world in which we live. Now, whether it needs to be separated in order to be more clear as to how much is going to each place—because I think it would be very hard for a lay person to decide that something was not military aid or that it was, particularly if it helped the economy of the country—we have not taken any definite stand as to the separation of it.

You understand, of course, the League, a grassroots operation, now in the process of making a program at the State level, can only state to you our past thinking which has been arrived at from the local groups in taking action, so that we are limited basically in projecting ourselves too far into the future, except that we will share again in our group our thinking today and the thinking of the people in the groups.

Mr. CARNAHAN. You do think it would help in evaluating our foreign aid if you knew the portion that was assigned to military aid and the portion that was assigned to—

Mrs. DAVIS. I think we have some figures, 24 million being the total, and at this point I think it has been gradually rising, the percentage that is going to military. We are concerned about that.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Do you feel that as you understand it, more of the aid should be given to economic aid and technical assistance?

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes; and this further thing, wherever possible, that the United Nations technical assistance program be used or that we become a part to the very fullest extent, recognizing, of course, their limitations at this time in history, but that this is the ultimate goal, and that in order to become a part of the world in which we live to work through the organization, which is the world organization, for helping us to keep peace in the world.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I believe that we can get from your statement that you feel that economic and technical assistance should be a basic part of our foreign policy?

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Davis, we appreciate this fine statement. When the budget was presented—you hear a great deal of talk about the budget these days—there was about \$45 billion estimated for protection, and out of that \$4.4 billion for foreign aid. Now, recently the President has suggested that perhaps the military can be cut by \$500 million making

a total of about \$3.9 billion for foreign aid. My question is this, in consideration of the money that is being spent, we should call it mutual security——

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. MERROW. Do you think, does the League think, that \$4 billion is a large sum of money with reference to what is being spent for our own defense? Is it too large or isn't it large enough? What do you think about the amount that has been projected?

Mrs. DAVIS. I think we would never feel in a position to decide on specific amounts. We just feel technical assistance is important to the long-range planning in this business of securing peace. The importance, as we have studied the causes of war and other areas along the way, is that this is a means of creating the climate in which peace can be had. As to the exact amount, we would have no way of saying, except that the proportion seems out of proportion to us, when 62 percent, for instance, goes to military aid, as I believe the figure bears out, and the smaller percentage goes for technical assistance. We feel that the latter program is more important in the long range, but we are not saying at this point, for instance, to do away with all military aid.

Mr. MERROW. We hear a great deal of talk about how the foreign aid and mutual security program should be cut. Do you and the League feel opposed to such a cut? Are you disturbed about the fact that it might be cut drastically?

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes, we are.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mrs. Davis, I notice you make the statement that your group has repeatedly reaffirmed its stand for a downward revision of tariffs through reciprocal trade agreements; you also say it advocates a tariff policy based on the general public interest, not on special sectional or group interests. I think that generally is a good statement, and would you elaborate a little bit further on it? I will give you this observation as a basis. Do you think that the, say, technical industry in America and the plywood industry in other sections of our country in America, do you think that we should give serious consideration to working out a reciprocal trade agreement that will protect and preserve those industries in America so that they will not be destroyed, go into bankruptcy?

Mrs. DAVIS. I think the statement is a true statement of our feeling, that it, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, is in the interest of the general public. Now, if that particular industry, in thinking and planning for reciprocal trade agreement, would be to preserve as it is, status quo, that particular segment of our community, then I would say yes. But if it is not, as we sincerely doubt, as we studied many times the pressures that were brought to bear on the reciprocal trade agreements by particular interest groups, and certainly as you evaluated it you come to the conclusion that it was not in the general public's interest, therefore we certainly would, within the framework of our thinking, say that this was not to happen. Reciprocal trade says just exactly what we believe is a firm foundation, that countries agree to certain procedures and thereby facilitate world trade, which we feel is of vital importance in the day in which we live, and that if individuals have to suffer even as we sometimes have to

face up to our own husbands' business connections—we still come up to the real fact that it is shortsightedness to give precedence or privilege to special interest groups in the field of world trade.

MR. CARNAHAN. Mr. LeCompte.

MR. LECOMPTE. I took a good deal of time before so I will pass.

MR. CARNAHAN. Mr. Hays.

MR. HAYS of Arkansas. Mrs. Davis, do you feel that your observations about the tariff reflect the sentiment of the people generally of this area? Are they world-trade minded?

MRS. DAVIS. We did quite a study, it was on the national agenda 2 years ago, and we did a tradesurvey within industry in the Midwest. I think it was not only helpful to them but to ourselves to realize how dependent we are even in this isolated area on world trade, and I think therefore we became more aware locally. Certainly, nationally, both coast Leagues have been aware of it for a long time, but this helped us to see the importance of world trade.

MR. HAYS of Arkansas. You export a lot of meat products, do you not?

MRS. DAVIS. Yes, and it was interesting to us, the need of interchange in industry. Somehow we have been slow in the Midwest to recognize this fact and we thought of ourselves as being pretty well self-sufficient.

MR. HAYS of Arkansas. I was in the Caribbean area some time ago and they said "we want more meat, we want meat products but we cannot buy because you will not take some of our products." So if we can think in terms of a large enough circle, and in this interdependence that you speak of, try to solve the textile problem that plagues Mr. Fountain and me, for example, we would have a larger purchasing power abroad?

MRS. DAVIS. Yes.

MR. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund.

MR. SAUND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know before the Government can have any program it has to send it to its own people first. We are talking about this foreign aid program. In rough terms, the President's recommended budget calls for \$4½ billion. If the people in the country, members of the League, were told in plain terms that \$4 billion of that money or more is for military aid, which must be considered a part of our own military defense, and only a very small part for economic and technical aid, do you think that would help matters in selling the idea to the public? Would there be so much talk about giving money away to foreign countries?

MRS. DAVIS. I think all factual information is what the League is seeking—and to get it to the communities. Certainly that is the sort of thing we want to give, facts. Everybody in the League should be informed; we have to make up our minds as individuals and we have to understand. It would be very helpful, sir, to have this information in plain terms.

MR. SAUND. You are in contact with your members at all times. Do you believe that the average member of your League in Kansas City understands that particular proportion: that of \$4½ billion, \$4 billion is for military aid and less than one-half billion is for technical aid? Do they realize that?

MRS. DAVIS. I hope they do. It is a part of thinking people and we are concerned. I would hate to speak for individuals, that they actually understood it. We hope they understand.

Mr. SAUND. You would then approve the President's statement. He wants to differentiate, he wants to take out the military part and put it in the defense program. Do you think that is a good idea?

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Do you feel that sufficient or adequate information through all of the available means of communication is reaching the American people so that the majority of them are in a position to form an opinion about our foreign aid program or our foreign policy?

Mrs. DAVIS. I have a feeling that there is considerably more available than the average citizen is taking advantage of. I mean, I think maybe some of us who have watched it a little closer seem to feel they are a little lax. I think we have to be realistic in this particular area, that there is a lack of, I don't want to say vital interest, that is not what it means, but of concern for international affairs. I was speaking this morning to the effect that, as I have lived here all my life, I see by comparison a tremendous growth in awareness of world concern, whereas we had thought we were pretty self-sufficient; I think it is recognized in the Midwest now that we are not, and that we are a part of one world. But I also feel that we bring a feeling of not having the answers and therefore the kind of the idea that someone else is going to find them for us. That certainly is a personal observation from someone who has lived in the Midwest. As I look back I see so much more concern of average people in the world in which we live than what there was, but I still don't feel that the majority of the people are identifying themselves with the solution. They see themselves as a part of this world problem but I am afraid that they are not feeling their part, or that they can be a part of the solution.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mrs. Davis.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you very much.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Next we will call Mr. Starkey.

Reverend TAYLOR. I am not Mr. Starkey, but I am appearing on behalf of that committee, sir.

Mr. CARNAHAN. If you haven't included it in the statement we would like just a brief statement of personal background for the record.

You may proceed.

**STATEMENT OF REV. THURSTON TAYLOR, BOARD OF CHRISTIAN
SOCIAL RELATIONS OF THE SOUTHWEST MISSOURI CONFERENCE
OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, KANSAS CITY, MO.**

Reverend TAYLOR. It is not my personal statement, my own personal identification, because I inherited the statement only recently to prepare for this committee.

My name is Thurston Taylor. I am pastor of a local Methodist Church here in the city. I serve as a member of the Board of Christian relations of the Southwest Board of Conference of the Methodist Church. I have been asked to submit this report in the absence of Dr. Starkey at this hearing today.

In presenting this statement to the committee, we are seeking to make a Christian witness in this area of our lives which is so vital to Americans and to all peoples. In making this witness, we particularly

base our thinking upon Christ's injunction that we should love our neighbors as ourselves and upon His suggestion that all men are brothers and neighbors.

With these considerations in mind, and realizing the destructive nature of modern military weapons, we must first stress the need for a continual creative effort to achieve a constructive peace. We would ask that this search proceed on as many fronts as possible. Certainly, our Government should continue its attempts to achieve some level of disarmament, even though this cannot be as extensive as we might wish at this time. We support President Eisenhower's open skies proposal and hope that it may lead to further disarmament. If the present attempt should fail, we would urge that our Government seek other solutions. Similarly, we feel that the testing of nuclear weapons should be limited or halted as soon as possible to avoid the uncertain dangers of radioactivity and to emphasize our interest in peace rather than war.

To lay sounder bases for a constructive peace, we would urge that our Government continue and extend its cooperation with other countries in as many areas as are possible and are consistent with our principles. This implies continued support for the United Nations and its associated organizations and continual improvement of these organizations as a means toward world understanding and solution of world problems. Furthermore, we should continue a positive cooperation with such bodies as the Organization of American States and the Colombo plan. Our membership in military organizations such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization should be used to help further the improvement of the areas involved in ways other than purely military.

While realizing the need for strategic defense, we are anxious that our Government should base its relations with other countries on a broad foundation of economic, cultural, and social cooperation. This requires a creative effort to seek new ways of cooperating with others. It should be done in a manner which would increase the sympathy for free democratic institutions and the likelihood of their further extension. In our opposition to communism we should stress our belief in the moral, spiritual, and political values and practices which communism rejects. We should emphasize our interest in helping all men achieve recognition of their human rights, of freedom, of self-government, and of a minimal standard of living. In this connection, our Government should establish policies and help establish a climate which would permit and encourage extensive contacts between Americans and other peoples, so that our actions and understanding may be based on a more solid foundation of human relations. Specifically, our Government should permit the free movement of people to and from all countries. This will increase our mutual understanding and help expand that free spirit to which we are devoted.

In encouraging the extension of self-government, we urge our Government to cooperate, wherever possible, with those seeking such right, without interfering in their affairs. We should seek to coordinate our interest in defense of the non-Communist world with our interest in the extension of self-government. In supporting the development of democratic self-government, we should stress respect for the dignity and freedom of individuals rather than our own eco-

conomic or political benefit. We should also seek to help new nations join constructively in the community of nations.

Since we Americans have been given the stewardship of great means for the improvement of man's life, we should meet our responsibility by helping other peoples solve problems in ways which are constructive and which develop their ability to help themselves. In this area we would support continuance of the technical-aid program, especially that of the United Nations. In order to make these programs more constructive, we would urge that it be placed on a long-range basis. Further, we should seek to work out means of sending to particularly needy peoples some of our food surplus, wherever this can be done without dislocating the economy of other countries.

In order to help solve the economic problems of this country and of the world as a whole, we would urge that our tariffs be lowered. This would enlarge the world trade area and decrease the need for foreign aid.

Since this country possesses a notable share of the world's power, we should recognize our obligation to use it for the good of others as well as of ourselves, helping to protect the rights of all peoples where we can fairly do so. In the light of this responsibility our Government should seek to formulate positive policies, in coordination with other interested states, which would help to solve the major problems in the areas of greatest tension and which can be understood by the American people and by others. Specifically, we should seek to prevent a repetition of the past year's developments in the Near East and to find meaningful policies for the problems of that area. In this connection we should seek at all times to coordinate power with peace and justice, using it not for its own sake, but to further the realization of those moral and spiritual values which this country stands for, and of the brotherhood of man under God as far as it may be realized in this world.

Thank you, sir.

MR. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Dr. Taylor, we appreciate your statement.

To give everybody an equal chance, we will start the questioning at the other end of the table this time.

MR. SAUND. Dr. Taylor, you said we should coordinate the use of power and modern force, if I understand. I believe you agree with me that the Aqaba Straits should be open to Israeli shipping, is that correct?

Reverend TAYLOR. That is correct.

MR. SAUND. If it becomes necessary to use force in order to maintain that status of keeping the Aqaba Strait open, would you be in favor of using military force on the part of the United States?

Reverend TAYLOR. If it was under the direction of the United Nations, as a United Nations force, not purely as a stand of a government in another state.

MR. SAUND. Would you be in favor of the United States sending a destroyer or a vessel there as a standby, that is, if there is any trouble from Egypt?

Reverend TAYLOR. It is my understanding the 6th Fleet is there for that purpose.

MR. SAUND. You do not believe the United States should use force unilaterally? It has to go through the United Nations, in your thinking?

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

MR. CARNAHAN. Mr. Le Compte.

MR. LE COMPTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Taylor, I suppose this is probably Dr. Starkey's statement but you endorse it?

Reverend TAYLOR. That is right. It was endorsed, as you see by the heading, by four of us on the committee.

MR. LE COMPTE. You say in effect that you are in favor of a long-range program?

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

MR. LE COMPTE. Actually, isn't that what we have now?

Reverend TAYLOR. It is the conviction of some of us who are citizens that our policies are determined to meet expediency rather, and the need of the movement, rather than a policy of developing particularly technical aid and assistance for the continued growth and education of those other citizens of the world.

MR. LE COMPTE. Well, but what I was getting at—that's fine—but the program would go forward for at least 3 years if this Congress doesn't do a thing; it would take that long to spend up the money, and if there is any appropriation this year it will probably be 3 years before it is expended. It takes a long time to make the plans, to earmark the money, and to actually get a program underway.

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

MR. LE COMPTE. So really we are doing what you say in long range?

Reverend TAYLOR. In essence it is a program looking toward long range.

MR. LE COMPTE. The tariffs that you speak of, they have been lowered and lowered and lowered through the years by the Congress authorizing the administration, not once but many times, to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements to the point where this country is the nearest to a free-trade country in the world.

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

MR. LE COMPTE. That is what you want even farther?

Reverend TAYLOR. Continued, yes, sir.

MR. LE COMPTE. Even without regard to what the effect might be on any particular industry such as Congressman Fountain speaks of?

Reverend TAYLOR. I think all of us realize, particularly again those of us who are citizens, that the balance must certainly be held in perspective between the world international economic situation and the national economic situation, and, too, understanding any plan that would undercut our own or any other nation's economic stability would, of course, be foolhardy in the interest of another program.

MR. LE COMPTE. I mean you are a protectionist for some industry; is that it?

Reverend TAYLOR. No, sir, I am not. I am a protectionist for the total economy, not necessarily for particular industries.

MR. LE COMPTE. Thank you very much, Brother Taylor.

MR. CARNAHAN. Mr. Hays.

MR. HAYS of Arkansas. Dr. Taylor, the Methodists have done a notable work in focusing attention on international problems. I would like to know to what extent you are stimulating discussion at the

local level, so that your men and your women are becoming acquainted with the intricacies of these questions.

Reverend TAYLOR. I am happy to answer that question, sir. In my dealing with people I find two levels of attitude. I find a minority that reads, that is informed, that has an international world outlook, particularly the women of the Methodist Church. I find a much larger majority of people who are highly nationalistic in their outlook and their concern and do not necessarily go with the leadership of our church in their international policy.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Are you taking note of the problem of church mechanics to stimulate that discussion that produces intelligent conclusions?

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir. The very committee on which I happen to be functioning on the conference level, our major program is one of education for the peoples of the local church, of awareness of study of the United Nations, international relations, and other social-economic problems that concern them from a Christian standpoint as citizens.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. You have helped the committee very much. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Dr. Taylor, do you consider the mutual-security aid program as a program working both ways; in other words, it aids the United States?

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. MERROW. Then, too, as we often hear it, the "giveaway program" is not the correct way to name it?

Reverend TAYLOR. No, sir; I have never been in sympathy with that mutual-aid program.

Mr. MERROW. Have you discussed the amount—I am thinking now of approximately the \$4 billion for military and economic aid—in relation to the budget in excess of \$40 billion for the total protection of the country?

Reverend TAYLOR. We are deeply concerned for, once again, the lack of proportion of those figures. I don't suppose any citizen, and I am speaking for myself, would ever feel himself adequately informed or prepared to name specifics in terms of numbers and figures as to what is the proper ratio, but certainly as a citizen we are concerned with the great overbalance of aid and assistance toward the military program in regard to technical aid and mutual assistance.

Mr. MERROW. I see. To break that down a little further with the revised estimates, about \$2 billion for military aid and \$1.9 million for defense support, purely technically, do you think that proportion is wrong?

Reverend TAYLOR. I cannot say. I think the proportion is out of balance. Whether or not it is wrong, when you survey the complete situation, it takes an individual with more insight and more knowledge of the total situation than I have.

Mr. MERROW. I spoke of the overall figure, and I don't know whether that might be confusing or not. But it is proposed, for instance, that we spend \$38 billion for our Army, Navy, and Air Force. Do you mean, from your response to the first question, that you feel that our foreign or our mutual-security assistance is low in

proportion to what we are spending for the total protection of our country; is that what you had in mind?

Reverend TAYLOR. That is right.

Mr. MERROW. We hear a great deal of talk about cutting foreign aid. Perhaps we can save some money here and there. But would you and the people you represent be alarmed by a great cut in foreign aid?

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes; I think we would, for this simple reason: Most of us, of our group, cannot believe that we exist in a world purely of ourselves, and that everything that happens within our world will have a direct repercussion upon us as such, and such a tremendous cut would eventually come back to our own doorstep.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Dr. Taylor, I am sure you heard Dr. Bragg, the first witness, testify this morning—

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Who, as I understood, advocates a policy of unmistakable firmness on the part of this country toward the Communist world, so firm that there will be no misunderstanding as to what we will do under a certain set of circumstances. Do you agree with that policy?

Reverend TAYLOR. Not to the extent that it will be an individual national policy. If that were carried to the United Nations, I would be in agreement with it.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. In other words, if our Nation, through the Congress and through the President, should conclude that the security of this Nation and the world is in such grave danger as to require force on our part, you would still insist on action through the United Nations, where something might happen to block necessary action?

Reverend TAYLOR. My judgment would be, sir, that, if you were to have your back against the wall in such extenuating circumstances, certainly the Nation would have to act to the best interest and wisdom that its legislators would have for it, but it would have to be, in my opinion, an extremely extenuating circumstance for them to abandon the present organization that is set up to handle—

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Then I take it that you would urge that we exercise every caution and use every effort to have our point of view prevail in the United Nations so that the United Nations would take proper action?

Reverend TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. But, under circumstances where the United Nations does not take action, you still feel that we, the people of America, through our leaders, should exercise the best judgment we have and govern ourselves accordingly?

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Just one short question, Dr. Taylor. I believe from your statement that you would urge our aid or our mutual help throughout the world on a people-to-people basis as much as possible?

Reverend TAYLOR. Yes, sir; also, the endorsement there of the agencies and organizations of the United Nations, as in the statement.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you sir.,

We are going to take one more witness and then we are going to declare a brief recess. We are expecting President Truman to appear

before the committee at 11 o'clock, and we want to be ready for him to give his presentation as soon as he arrives.

We will take one more witness. That will be Mr. Barker.

Mr. Barker, if you will, give us the usual brief personal comment for the record, please.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN T. BARKER, ATTORNEY AND SPEAKER,
MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, KANSAS CITY, MO.**

Mr. BARKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

John T. Barker, attorney at law, 1228 Baltimore Avenue, Kansas City, Speaker, Missouri House of Representatives; attorney general of Missouri, city counselor of Kansas City, special assistant to the Attorney General in Washington; president, Kansas City (Mo.) Bar Association; member, House of Delegates, and American Bar Association for 15 years.

Presidents Roosevelt and Truman organized the Marshall plan and NATO and such other organizations and such groups for the purpose of helping the world after World War II. They never intended, and nobody ever intended, that they would be permanent, and today, unless Herbert Hoover, George Humphreys, Harry Byrd, and Clarence Cannon stop this administration in its giveaway program, giving money to Afghanistan, Iraq, Spain, Italy, France, Turkey, England, Thailand, Japan, Philippines, Hawaii, Germany, Liberia, and Greece, dozens of other countries, the panic of the late 1920's will be nothing. We just must quit giving away all of our resources.

I know, if you don't, Russia is laughing at us. I know that from papers I read, and from people who have been in Russia. They think we are headed for the poorhouse. Those groups were all right at the time, but the war has been over 12 years. Taxes are so high now, it is confiscation. A few are getting special tax reductions, and those few are becoming rich. All the others are having trouble making a living. Today we owe more than \$300 billion in public debts, and, I expect, over \$600 billion in private debts. Nobody has the slightest idea we will ever pay that. No Member of Congress, I don't think, would say that we ever expect to pay our debts. We owe more today than the rest of the world together, take all the world together.

Now, we can't finance another war, can we? I estimate it will cost \$600 billion to start another war. Who is going to let us have that money? We haven't got it; you can't get it from these people out here [indicating]; they are taxed to death. Who is going to loan you \$600 billion? That is why there is no danger of another war; it is just pure propaganda. There is no possible danger of Russia assailing this country; write it up on your walls when you get back to Washington. If Russia comes over and drops a bomb on us, I will come back and eat it. What I am trying to say is, we need money so badly in this country that it seems to me that Congress should try and help some of the suffering here in America before going all out for foreign countries.

Juvenile delinquency and communism go hand in hand, they ride right along together. If we would give the legally organized groups just 1 cent out of every dollar that you give away to foreign countries, just 1 cent, they could take that and make a big dent in juvenile de-

linquency and communism, such groups as De Molay, Boy and Girl Scouts, Boys Clubs, Boys Town, Big Brothers, the Negro groups, Jewish, Catholic and Protestant groups. We give them nothing and yet we give other countries billions to fight communism. It doesn't make sense to give the Dominican Republic money to fight communism and not give it to these groups. These groups do it through the State. Give the State of New York money to bring the boys off the street, keep the girls off the street, get them in clubrooms, get them away from this human delinquency which leads to communism.

Only the rich today can go to a hospital, you all know that better than I do. Thousands of people are suffering badly in every county in America, need to be treated, and they cannot afford to go to a hospital. It will cost them thirty to fifty dollars a day to go to a hospital. We should help the average man with his hospital bills, if you've got any money that you don't need. The money we gave away last year to 1 country, just 1 country, England, would have built 1 nice hospital in every county in the United States, it would have built 1 fine school in every county in the United States, it would have supported and maintained that hospital and school for 100 years.

In America every family should have a vacation, and their children, at least 2 weeks a year. They should go to the seashore, they should go to the mountains. They are entitled to that as a price of their Americanism. They cannot go now and do not go now, because you are taxing them so high that they can't get out of their town. Reduce those taxes and allow the children of America to have a week or two at the seashore or in the mountains. We are paying for vacations for other countries. You are paying for vacations for Germans, so I get from people who have been there, and tell me they see them going to the shores and the mountains on our money. It just doesn't make sense to me that we will give vacations to foreigners and not to Americans.

The slums in the United States are getting worse and worse each year, and if you don't think so, go to any city in America. I have seen dozens and dozens of them getting worse and worse. We clean up the slums in other countries. You are appropriating vast sums of money to clean up the slums of Europe. Could you give us just a little something to clean up the slums of the United States?

Students of government and students of law have been unable to find any authority in the Constitution to give away this money to foreign countries in times of peace or in any other times as you are doing today. Presumably it is under the general welfare clause, which means much or means nothing. If a test case was brought in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right of this country to give away this money to 40 or 50 foreign countries to buy caviar, sweetbreads, sirloin steaks, that Court would find a way to refuse jurisdiction, and I venture the guess that that Court will never pass on your right to do that. That Court was organized to pass on such questions as a guide for the legislative body, but it has passed on few, if any, of these questions, and has refuted recently the Utah case and others, to pass on any of these problems. If Congress today would demand that the Supreme Court would tell under what power of the Constitution it has a right to give this money to the Dominican Republic and Haiti and Iraq and those countries

for vacations for their children and so forth, the effect of this is to make those countries rich and make us poor. Is that constitutional?

It is thought that Washington has gone wild on spending, looking for countries, new countries, exploring new lands to give money to. Why, we have discovered recently there is an effort, and I venture the prediction that within 6 months a loan of a hundred million dollars will be given to Africa. Maybe they will find another country next year, another new country. Members of Congress, so it is thought out here, cease to be Missourians, Iowans, North Carolinians, Kansans, Californians and others when they go to Congress. They apparently become Washingtonians and the only official words you ever hear in Washington is billions, b-i-l-l-i-o-n-s. The word "millions" has long disappeared. No cocktail party ever speaks of millions any more, it speaks of billions.

Let's quit this "give away" and build a strong United States at home. There is no possible danger of another world war; nobody can finance it. Do nations have the bombs? It would be plain suicide for a nation to attempt to do that. You cannot prevent Russia from dropping bombs on us. If Russia wants to drop a bomb on us tomorrow, you can't stop it. You can retaliate; you can prepare yourself to defend America; use some of your money at home.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Barker, we appreciate your statement. It certainly is a challenging statement.

Do you recommend a reduction in the defense budget?

Mr. BARKER. Absolutely and unequivocally.

Mr. CARNAHAN. To achieve the things you think we ought to be doing for our own people?

Mr. BARKER. You are fooled by it; this country is very economically minded. This city is in a very bad situation financially. We had an election just recently on an earnings tax. I think it carried in four precincts. There was just an overwhelming vote against it. This country is sick and tired of taxes, and you will see it in the 1958 election.

Mr. CARNAHAN. You believe our economy will not support us as a friendly nation among the other nations of the world and at the same time give the services that our own people feel that they should have? It is, in your opinion, a choice; we must do one or the other?

Mr. BARKER. That is right, take care of our own and give to these others, if you want to, but I don't know where you get the idea of giving to these other people.

Mr. CARNAHAN. You consider anything that is given in a foreign mutual-assistance program as a giveaway?

Mr. BARKER. Undoubtedly it is a giveaway: you are getting nothing from them. You have soldiers in 47 countries, they'd gobble them up in a minute, and you know that.

Mr. CARNAHAN. In your opinion, there is no value at all to be derived for us from the expenditure of these funds?

Mr. BARKER. I can see none except this, you give the nation \$1,000 and they spend \$500 back; they buy textiles from North Carolina, cattle from Iowa; yes, you can do that, but how long can you last at that?

Mr. CARNAHAN. You raised a rather interesting question, you say we give them a thousand dollars?

Mr. BARKER. Yes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. And they spend \$500 of it in this country. What happens to the other \$500?

Mr. BARKER. They put that in their pocket and go on vacations to the seashores.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Where are dollars finally spent, Mr. Barker?

Mr. BARKER. You spend it in stores, lawyers' offices.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Where geographically, over the world, are dollars eventually spent?

Mr. BARKER. Anything you buy. We don't spend anything, we give.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The question I asked you is, where throughout the world finally do you spend a dollar?

Mr. BARKER. I don't know, Mr. Congressman, what you mean. You spend it any place you buy something, I guess. If I go to Mexico, I pay a hotel bill. If I go to England, I buy a suit of clothes. Is that what you mean?

Mr. CARNAHAN. If those dollars never came back into the United States, then our Government, and thus our taxpayers, would have no further obligation for any dollars that do not get back. If dollars in the possession of people in other countries do come back to the United States, they will come for the purchase of American products or American services or for payment of debts to individuals or to the Government. Not half of the dollars, as you say, but every dollar that is either loaned or given to people or government outside the United States will eventually be spent in the United States for goods or services produced by Americans or paid on debts to Americans.

What I am saying is that every dollar that leaves the United States will eventually be spent within the United States. Dollars cannot be detached from the United States economy.

Mr. BARKER. No; you have the fallacy, of course, that you can buy friends. That's been tried throughout the ages. It has never worked and it won't work now.

Mr. CARNAHAN. No; the question was not whether we are buying friends or not; my question was, Where are dollars ultimately spent?

Mr. BARKER. It does not return here, it stays over there, you don't get it back. Take Germany, all you got is two wars from Germany and you will have another one.

Mr. CARNAHAN. If our Government gives or loans dollars abroad and those dollars are never spent or paid to someone in this country, then our Government has no obligation for such dollars. Any person or group failing to spend these dollars in the United States would in effect be giving them to the United States Government.

Mr. BARKER. I don't know of any obligation, the Government has lost the dollar. We will never get back a cent from over there, not a penny, in friendship or anything else.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Barker, you have answered in part a question I have to ask. In referring to the mutual assistance program you have termed them giveaway programs, and you have answered that you do not feel in your opinion that we have accomplished anything by the program.

Mr. BARKER. No mutuality in it at all, Mr. Congressman, it is all a one-way street.

Mr. MERROW. In the second instance I assume that one could conclude that those who refer to them as giveaway programs, since

they have been passed by Congresses both in the Democratic and Republican administrations, feel that the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senators are just giving away money for the fun of giving it away.

Mr. BARKER. I think so. I have a friend, Congressman Thompson, from Rock Island, Ill., he says in the State Department, he says they have 6 or 7 scoop shovels over there, he says they scoop this money out in scoop shovels over there, that is what the Congressman says.

Mr. MERROW. I was just wondering why you assumed since this has to be passed by the Congress that everybody was in a mad rush to give away the money. I voted for these programs and as far as I was concerned I was doing it for the security of the United States. I didn't want the impression that we were just throwing it away.

Mr. BARKER. I think the Democrats, answering your question, think the President, President Eisenhower, is a miser, and I think my party thinks Mr. Eisenhower is stingy. I think my Democratic friends—

Mr. MERROW. You think Congress is mistaken?

Mr. BARKER. I think Congress appropriated too much money anyway. There will be elections 2 years from now, let's see how it works.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. General, I don't have any questions. I share some of your fears, I don't go as far as you do, but I think you have made yourself perfectly clear, so we don't need to ask too many questions to know exactly where you stand. I like that kind of witness.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I might say that General Barker and I have been very intimate friends over a long period of years and I know his views so I do not have to ask him questions. I would ask you, General, if it is true that the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration, Truman administration, and the Eisenhower administration has been about the same in a general way.

Mr. BARKER. One hundred percent, except I think President Eisenhower thinks he can give away more than the Democrats. He is wrong about that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Well, the policy that we embarked on started a good while ago, then, 15 or 20 years ago.

Mr. BARKER. President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, just exactly 3 in 1, 1 in 3.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you for coming before this committee.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I won't ask any more questions because I know his views so intimately.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No questions.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund.

Mr. SAUND. No questions.

Mr. CARNAHAN. We will declare a few minutes recess.

(Short recess taken.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. The committee will come to order.

Let me proceed by saying, Mr. President, that I speak for every member of the subcommittee when I say that we are aware of the great honor of having you with us this morning, and that we welcome

the opportunity of receiving your counsel on the important issues of foreign policy which confront the United States today. It is an especial pleasure and privilege to be able to meet with you here in Kansas City, in the surroundings with which you are identified in the minds of all of our people.

I would like to remind all of us of some of the foundation stones on which the United States foreign policy of 1957 rests. Let me cite first a message which you sent to the Congress on March 12, 1947, 10 years ago, which contained these words, and I quote:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures

These words have come to be known as the Truman Doctrine and mark a milestone in the history of the United States, and, I am confident, in the history of the world.

One of the most frustrating aspects of the decade of the thirties to an American who was interested in foreign affairs was the fact that we could see the world disintegrating before our very eyes and were aware that the United States was not attempting to do anything about it. When the Truman doctrine was enunciated and the Congress approved the Greek-Turkish Aid Act which it called for, it meant that we were not going to stand on the sidelines during the postwar period and watch the world disintegrate and ultimately succumb to the dictators of world communism.

Let me quote next from Secretary Marshall's address at Harvard on June 5, 1947:

It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace.

This announcement by your Secretary of State marked another major advance in our foreign policy.

I would like to quote next from your message to the Congress of July 25, 1949, in which you said:

To continue and strengthen our program for world peace and national security I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing military aid to the free nations to enable them to protect themselves against the threat of aggression and contribute more effectively to the collective defense of world peace.

This statement of policy, followed by the enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, marked another milestone in our determination to aid other nations in their effort to resist aggression.

Finally, I would like to read one sentence from your inaugural address, January 20, 1949, and again I quote:

Fourth We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

Everyone recognizes these words which have come to be known as the Point 4 program in all parts of the world. I think all of us have to recognize today, regardless of party, that the United States foreign policy rests on the foundation of the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act and Point 4. The issues with which we are confronted and the procedures for dealing with them involve pretty much the application of these basic approaches to changing situations. Under these circumstances, Mr. President, we await with great anticipation your counsel.

**STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, FORMER PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES, INDEPENDENCE, MO.**

Mr TRUMAN. Thank you, Mr Chairman, thank you very much. You are very kind, indeed, to remind me of those historical events, but may I say to you before I start off that the objective was a foreign policy of the United States that would eventually bring peace to the world. There was no intention to have any programs or series of programs named for anyone. I was very happy when they named the Marshall plan after General Marshall on account of his speech at Harvard in June 1947. Previous to that I had sent Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, to Cleveland, Miss., to talk on the same subject for me. He read my speech down there. I want it distinctly understood that the foreign policy of the United States is a continuing affair, and it is not proper, in my opinion, to name any part of it for me individually, because I was working for the whole country at large. That was the objective we had in view.

I would like to talk to you just a few minutes about the foreign policy of the United States and how it originated, how I came to feel that we had to take the actions we did at the time I was President, and why it is necessary to continue those actions at the present time.

The foreign policy of this country originated in the Continental Congress. If you remember, we had a couple of very wise gentlemen in Europe at that time. One was Benjamin Franklin, who had been the agent of the Colonies in England before our disagreement with Great Britain. Then he went to France where he was so well thought of that he succeeded in his efforts to get assistance from France. Afterwards Thomas Jefferson went to France for the same purpose, and our friendship was a continuing one up until 1798 when we had some difficulty with the French due, I think, to some misunderstanding of their policy and to the fact that the wars between Britain and France interfered with our commerce.

Washington and Jefferson had the same ideas on a foreign policy of the United States at the time of its infancy. It used to be the policy of the United States Senate—I don't know whether they continue it or not—on Washington's birthday to read his Farewell Address with emphasis on isolationism. I could point to another address, and that is Thomas Jefferson's first address to Congress in which he practically repeated what Washington said in his Farewell Address. But conditions had changed greatly when he was talking to James Monroe on his approach to the policy of the Western Hemisphere to remain free from European influence, and he said almost exactly the same things that were said later in regard to the foreign policy of the United States back in 1837.

The historical policy of James Monroe was one to keep the republics of the Western Hemisphere free. Then during the War Between the States—and since you, Mr Chairman, are named for Albert Sidney Johnston, I will continue to say the "War Between the States"; my mother always did; my mother died unreconstructed—it was a very bad situation for the Government of the United States. Every effort had been made to create a situation where Great Britain would move into the South and take a hand in the settlement of the difficulties between ourselves. That did not happen, and I am very happy that it didn't. I am happy that we have one republic on this continent—

the greatest republic in the history of the world—instead of four, which we would have had if Britain had interfered.

The next step, as I remember—and I can remember this one—was the difficulty of Grover Cleveland in Venezuela over boundaries between the British colonies and Venezuela. Mr. Cleveland made a statement on just where our country stood, and the situation was settled to the satisfaction of all concerned. If he had not done so, some of Venezuela's territory would have been taken over by the British Government.

Two administrations after that came the difficulties between Colombia and the United States over the Panama Canal, and Theodore Roosevelt took the action that was necessary in order to build the canal. I am going through these things to show you how the foreign policy was developed over a period, and then I want to make my argument on the policy as it now stands.

There was the Boxer Rebellion, if you remember, in the McKinley administration, and John Hay's Open Door Policy was another approach to a worldwide policy on the part of the United States so that trade could be carried on with China by all powers instead of having a closed door for the benefit of only the colonial powers there at the time.

Then came World War I and Wilson's international program. He was frustrated in that program because some of the Members of the Congress did not feel that we were ready for an international policy, and his treaty, to support the League of Nations, was turned down, due to the efforts of Henry Cabot Lodge, the Senator from Massachusetts. Then World War II came along because we had not accepted the responsibilities of our position in the world.

During Harding's administration came the Nine-Power treaties in which we sunk our Navy; then we had to build another one which was sunk at Pearl Harbor; and then we had to build another one. These things happened to us because we did not understand what history tries always to teach us. History is my favorite reading. I was the kind of a fellow when going to school who could not see very well. I couldn't play much baseball, and when I did play, they had me for umpire because I couldn't see. I was at a game not long ago, and some man sitting up behind me said about the umpire, "Get that man a seeing-eye dog," and that is what I needed when I was trying to do some backlot umpiring.

After World War II, of course, isolationism was ended, and we went into an international program completely, brought about by the organization of the United Nations in 1945 and due to the treaties made with our allied friends up to that time. When the situation developed that one of the signatories to the United Nations Charter and to those treaties which had been made with us failed to live up to the programs, the cold war started. In fact, in the first year after the Potsdam Conference the Russians broke 32 of their agreements with us. If it had not been for that, there would have been no cold war, no Greek and Turkish policy, no Berlin Airlift and no Korea. The Russians decided they were going to convert the whole world to communism, and I will come to that in a short time.

The Greek and Turkish program was one simply to prevent the Russians from doing what Peter the Great wanted to do 300 years before, and that was to obtain control of the Black Sea Straits. They

still have that in view, and if we are not careful, they'll be able to do it. Sending the Sixth Fleet into the Mediterranean may help to prevent it.

At the Potsdam Conference I made a suggestion to the people assembled there that the Black Sea Straits, the Suez Canal, the Kiel Canal, the Rhine-Danube barge canal, from the North Sea to the Black Sea, the Straits of Gibraltar and the Panama Canal should all be open waterways to merchant ships paying for their upkeep on the usual riparian rights basis in times of peace. That program is still possible. Had Stalin not so strenuously opposed it, and had Great Britain not been so lukewarm about it, there would have been no Suez crisis. I do not like to say what might have been—they're the saddest of all sad words according to John Greenleaf Whittier—but I think it can still be done.

What we are faced with now is the Near East situation for which you gentlemen are trying to develop a solution, and I sincerely hope you can do it. I think you can.

Russia is at the back of all of our difficulties. You will find that in the last 30 years Russia has built up the second most powerful industrial machine in the world, and a formidable military machine, developed some of her natural resources, and developed them with slave labor; that is, they have forced people, whether they want to do it or not, to work in their automobile factories and their shoe factories and their military production factories. But they have failed to make the world communistic. That is what they started out to do. They have failed to incorporate all of Eastern Europe into a Russian hierarchy, which is their greatest failure. It is my opinion they haven't convinced even their own people that what they are doing is right. They claim that they are educated—that they are educating everyone in Russia and that eventually they will have the best educated people in the world, people, that is, who can read and write, but they are "educated" on a slanted basis. The Russian people cannot get all the facts, and those who somehow do are considered deviationists and become slave laborers in Russia's mines and factories.

I do not, myself, think that it is possible for us under any circumstances to let our guard down. It has been the policy of the Russians—and if I had a map here I could show you—to surround the Black Sea Straits and the Suez Canal and the tremendous natural resources of the Near East, in Iran, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia which have the greatest oil resources that the world has ever seen.

I will tell you a little history about that if you will bear with me. I sent Gordon Clapp and Dr. Bennett to the Near East to see what the situation was and what could be done about it. The main difficulty is the population—the difficulty of getting something to eat and to wear and a place in the world to live that is decent. Gordon Clapp investigated the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys and found that the old canals built by the Babylonians and the people of Ninevah were still almost intact, and if they were cleaned out and repaired, that valley would still support 30 or 40 million people with things to eat and things to wear. Dr. Bennett also told me that. Dr. Bennett was the one who implemented the first part of Point 4. It is called Point 4 because it was the fourth point of my 1949 inaugural message to which you referred. He told me that in Ethiopia there is a plateau of about 62,000 square miles from six to eight thousand feet high, with soil exactly like that in north Missouri and Iowa, black soil,

anywhere from 24 to 36 feet deep that could grow enough food for a hundred million people. It wouldn't be necessary to move such a population there because they are just next door in the Near East and India.

I also had Gordon Clapp make a suggestion about the difference in elevation between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea. It is about 1,260 feet. He came back with this idea, that a syphon 100 yards in diameter from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea would create enough power in that 1,260-foot fall to meet all the industrial requirements of these places we have been talking about all the way from the Adriatic Sea to Libya, and the people of those countries would then be content to live together without quarreling. If some of these things could be done, it would be an investment, not a gift. The Nile River, if properly harnessed, would create enough food and fiber for another 20 million people in that same valley. In looking over the map and realizing that our civilization originated in the Nile and Euphrates valleys, I had a hazy idea that we could contribute by taking that civilization back there.

Let us retain our containment policy as far as Russia is concerned. Let us listen to every peaceful program that the Soviets may have to offer us, but let us be sure that they cannot do again what they did at Potsdam. We do not want to give up our guns until we know that they have given up theirs.

Back in 1945 I made a proposition to Russia and the United Nations for the control of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The United Nations committee in charge of that had some 270 meetings, and every time a proposal was put to the Russians, they vetoed it. We told them time and time again that if they would let us look, they could look, and then we could come to a disarmament conference that would be a real one. But we ought to have a police force to keep the peace of the world, just as we have in Kansas City to keep peace here and a National Guard to keep peace in Missouri, or in any other State. I am trying to say that the situation is not all black. Favorable conditions can be developed if we keep our heads and keep our powder dry.

Mr. Chairman, that is about all I have to say.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. TRUMAN. I will listen to any questions you may have.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Again I want to say how honored we are to have you visit with the committee.

Mr. TRUMAN. It is a pleasure to me, Mr. Chairman. I am here because I want to show you the hospitality of Jackson County. You see, you are working in the biggest suburb of my hometown, and I want you to feel entirely welcome.

Mr. CARNAHAN. We are very glad to be here.

Would you care to comment on whether there should be a permanent U. N. police force?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think it will be necessary in the long run. I do not see how the peace could be maintained unless we have a police force—not a military force—that can help maintain peace. I do not think the little countries ought ever to be in a position where they are afraid, of what might go on in the United Nations. The two great powers, Russia and the United States, really control things, and it is necessary for us to build this thing up in such a manner that we act just as Missouri does with Illinois or Arkansas or Tennessee. We are not

afraid of Federal Government control any more, and I do not mean that we should have a federal world government, just an agency to keep peace in the world. And that agency cannot keep the peace with words; it has to have something besides that.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, there recently has been considerable criticism of the mutual-aid program in Iran. Would you care to comment on that program?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am not familiar with the situation up to date because I don't have a Central Intelligence Agency any more, but when you look at the map, Iran is in a very precarious position. I think, aside from India and China, she has the longest border next to the Russians, right on her northern border, all the way along. Iran has an immense potential in oil and agriculture and everything else. In fact, Iran, or Persia, as it was called then, used to be the head capital of the whole Far East. She conquered India and China and owned all the territory up to the Caspian Sea. I am very much worried about what is going to happen. In 1945 we made an agreement that we would take our troops out of Iran, Russia and ourselves. We had a passway through there, if you remember, to furnish Russia with tanks and guns and things with which the Russians helped to win the war. We moved our troops out, but when the Russians didn't, I had to send a message to Stalin to get his troops out of there or we would move back in. He took them out. That seems to be the only language they can understand, unless they have had a change of heart, which I hope they have.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Truman, I wanted to join in with the chairman in expressing appreciation to you for appearing this morning. You have certainly conferred a great honor on this subcommittee by coming here and giving us your opinions on matters of foreign policy.

Mr. TRUMAN. You are very kind.

Mr. MERROW. I recall that in 1947 you wrote me a very nice letter after I expressed the feeling in the summer that the Congress ought to be called back; and later that year, in November, you called the Congress back and suggested that we adopt a program of interim aid; which we did.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is right.

Mr. MERROW. I was very happy to support that and I was very pleased to vote for the Truman doctrine in support of aid to Greece and Turkey, for the Marshall program and so on. Those acts that were mentioned by the chairman were certainly great foundation stones in the construction of our foreign policy.

I would like to ask, do you feel that we should adopt some kind of a long-range program, not perhaps on a year-to-year basis, but a long-range economic program?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think it will be necessary, but the difficulty with that situation is that the Constitution specifically forbids continuing appropriations. Of course, you could create a policy of making authorizations over a period of years. In the policy that was pursued toward Greece and Turkey Congress was informed that it would be a 4-year program, calling for so much money the first year, so much the second, and so on to the end. Actually it did not cost as much as I said it would, but it was a continuing proposition on a policy created by the Congress. After that they never hesitated to make

the appropriations, but they could never make an appropriation extending beyond a 2-year period, if I read the Constitution correctly.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. President, you made two statements in your remarks this morning with which I agree wholeheartedly. You said you were glad to see that the Sixth Fleet had moved into the eastern Mediterranean and that under no circumstances—or words to that effect—should we let our guard down. Is it your feeling that we took proper action in the Middle East in the adoption of what is known as the Eisenhower Doctrine and that we take proper action by following it up and showing that we mean business?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct. That is the only way that you can ever come to a conclusion. It has to be followed through with action. All the conversation in the world won't get you anywhere unless you act, and I am speaking from experience.

Mr. MERROW. Then, keeping ourselves in position so we could repel aggression, so if aggression should take place against the United States, is absolutely necessary, even if it costs 35 or 40 million dollars?

Mr. TRUMAN. Of course, it is absolutely essential. We spent between 500 and 600 billion dollars getting ready for an affair which would have been stood off had we been ready to meet it on the nose at the time. We can only base our future welfare on what has happened in the past. Of course, the expense is tremendous. I want to say now that one of the greatest things in the history of the world has been the attitude of the United States as a victor in World War II, and also in World War I, in which we were perfectly willing to help the people whom we had defeated to come back to life. It has never happened in the history of the world. We didn't want territory. I made that statement at Potsdam and almost gave my military people heart failure. I said that we were not after reparations, that we wanted only world peace after which we would all profit, and that is all we want today.

Mr. MERROW. I think you did a tremendous thing in foreign policy when you announced the Point 4 program. Do you feel that the economic aid that we are extending in some areas is more important than the military aid?

Mr. TRUMAN. I have always thought in the long run it would be. I don't know now. I have no Central Intelligence Agency, and I don't have the information. All I can talk to you about on the present situation is what I see in the papers, and sometimes I don't believe all that. But I want to say to you that I think in the long run economic aid is of much more importance than military aid. If we can establish a peace program where everyone has everything he needs, we won't have to support a great military machine. But we have to do that in conjunction with the other great powers of the world. We can't do it by ourselves.

Mr. MERROW. We hear a great deal about the budget these days, and I want to ask, do you or would you view with alarm a drastic cut in foreign aid, which, after all, isn't a terrific percentage against the overall amount?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think it would be a bad thing to take a butcher knife and carve it up. You have to look at each individual case, as you always do, and then come to a sensible conclusion that is for the welfare and benefit of the world. Always keep in mind that the objective is world peace. That is the only reason in the world for

foreign aid—to attain world peace without spending all the rest of our substance on a third world war.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you. Again I want to express deep appreciation for your appearance this morning.

Mr. TRUMAN. You are honoring me. I am just being, I hope, a courteous host to you gentlemen.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. President, I, for one, feel highly honored over your appearance before our committee because your very fine daughter not so long ago selected her husband from North Carolina.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think she made a good selection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Her husband was a classmate of mine, in fact, I think we entered the University of North Carolina at the same time, not too many years ago.

Was the Dr. Bennett you referred to the Dr. Bennett from North Carolina who—

Mr. TRUMAN. No. Dr. Bennett was the president of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. He went on a tour previous to the organization of these programs that we are talking about and spent almost a year in Ethiopia. Then he was the first chairman of the Point 4 program, to implement it all around the world. I never met a man in my life who was more interested in the development of the economic resources of these various countries. He was killed in an air accident at Baghdad.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I ask the question because the Dr. Bennett I know comes from North Carolina and is described as the father of soil conservation in America—in fact in the world.

Mr. TRUMAN. He was. It seems to be a good name for him.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I want to ask you one question, Mr. President, about something which has concerned me to no end, and I am sure it has concerned the average American. Do you feel that in recent months the statements of our Government and the actions of our Government following such statements have been sufficiently clear so that both our friends and our foes understand where we stand and what we would do under a given set of circumstances?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. Congressman, I hate to go into a political approach to this thing. I had an article published yesterday in about 85 newspapers that will answer your question, and I won't have to make a political statement in the record.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I assure you I did not intend to put you in such a position.

Mr. TRUMAN. I can't answer you without going into the political end. But you read that article. You will find it in yesterday morning's Kansas City Star and on the front page of the New York Times.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. President, personally I feel flattered beyond words that you took the time to come here, and I am not assuming to speak for the committee but I feel certain the individual members feel the same way.

Mr. TRUMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We feel honored and flattered no end that you are here.

I loved your statement; for the most part I endorse it as I have approved of much of your policies through the years.

In a general way you think efforts to have a united bipartisan foreign policy is the thing for this country?

Mr. TRUMAN. It is the best.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Fight out domestic issues at the elections between the parties because, after all, we have party government in this country.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is right.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. But if we can present bipartisan foreign policy for the rest of the world——

Mr. TRUMAN. Bipartisanship ought to end at the water's edge. The foreign policy of the United States is made by the President of the United States, and nobody else can make it. He can do it on advice; usually the President, and all the Presidents I have been acquainted with call in members of both parties to discuss what should be done. Every one of these documents and policies which have been discussed here were considered as a bipartisan program by every member of each party who was in any position of leadership. Partisanship ought to stop at the water's edge, and we ought to put on a completely united United States front to both friend and foe.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have spoken at length and spoken so well that I am not going to submit any further questions.

Mr. TRUMAN. Thank you very kindly.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. President, I have one question regarding the United Nations. As a preface I would like to make a footnote comment to what my friend, Mr. Merrow, had to say. He and I had the honor of representing the United States at the 10th General Assembly of the U. N.

Mr. TRUMAN. I remember that.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And it followed the memorable meeting in San Francisco when you journeyed there to address the 10th anniversary meeting. I would like to say to you that our hearts were warmed by the references to American participation and leadership in the charter signing. Mr. Merrow and I heard many expressions of personal appreciation for your leadership and what you had done to help provide the architecture of the United Nations.

Mr. TRUMAN. You are very kind.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I might say this about the personal side of it. I represent a cotton-growing State, and I was interested in the things that were done under our bilateral or unilateral program for the Marshall plan. I wanted to know where that cotton went, and so I asked about it. I found that Arkansas cotton went to Belgium, was made into fish nets that went to Norway; then Norway said to Italy, "If you will send citrus fruits to Belgium to pay for the nets we have gotten from Belgium, we will send you the fish that we catch in these nets." So we stimulated trade, and it is a good illustration of how the Arkansas cotton was marketed through the Marshall program.

Mr. President, as I recall, this multilateral stimulation of trade in Europe resulted from the stimulation of the Office of European Economic Cooperation. I just wonder if we don't have a parallel

between that demonstration and the things you suggested so wisely, it seems to me, about the Middle East tying its regional interests together. Is that a logical thought?

Mr. TRUMAN It certainly is. They have been working on that very situation between France and Germany, Belgium and the Benelux countries, and Norway and Sweden, and the very thing that you mentioned is what has come out of it. Every situation in the world that can be used for the very purpose of implementing a peacetime interchange of goods and services will help maintain the peace, because when peoples' interests are tied up like that they won't go shooting one another.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. You have made such a fine contribution on that score I wonder if you agree that if this kind of multilateral aid can be channeled through the United Nations and its auxiliary agencies, some of it should be done in that way.

Mr. TRUMAN I think you are right.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund.

Mr. SAUND Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. President, I really feel honored that I have the opportunity to sit so close to you.

Mr. TRUMAN. Thank you.

Mr. SAUND. In fact, I wish to make the statement that I do not belong to this particular subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. When I heard you were going to be here with us, I asked special permission to come here, and Mr. Carnahan was very gracious.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am very glad.

Mr. SAUND. I do wish to make a statement. I was born in India. In spite of the fact that I have no contact with the Government of India, I cannot disassociate the fact that I was born in India. No matter where I go or what subject I speak on, I am always asked, "Why do the Government of India and the people of India favor the Russians over the people of the United States?" They always cite the example that India gave such a tremendous ovation to Bulganin and Khrushchev when they visited there. Now, I do not know what will happen in the future, but I have a feeling, Mr. President, if you or President Eisenhower ever paid a visit to India, I feel that you will receive an ovation that will far exceed any of the Russians.

Mr. TRUMAN You are very kind, indeed.

Mr. SAUND. My wife and I drove 700 miles to hear you when you spoke in 1945 before the United Nations, and you must remember the kind of reception that you received; you had a hard time stopping those people from applauding and cheering. Now, that is the way that people of the world, and they include the people of India and other countries, in Asia and Africa, feel toward a great American who has worked so hard to bring about peace in this world.

Mr. TRUMAN. May I say to you that when I was in London last summer, it was my privilege to call on Mr. Nehru. I never had a more pleasant visit in my life than I had with him at that time. As you remember, he paid a visit to me while I was President of the United States, and I want to say that I do not believe that India is inclined to forget the friendship of the United States. India is in a very precarious geographical location. If you remember, I was

trying to illustrate that to you. It is in the same situation as Iran! India has to tread very carefully and try to remain a republic that will last from now on. She has to be very careful and kind to her neighbors, just as we have had to be, although sometimes we haven't been as kind to our neighbors as we should have been. I am of the opinion that India is going to be a free country and as great a republic as we anticipated it would be when it was made into a republic. That is the way I feel about India. I would like very much to make that visit.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. President, at every opportunity I have to speak—and the last time I spoke before the Institution of Foreign Affairs in Pittsburgh—I make this statement:

The debate in the minds of the people in India, Asia, and Africa today is not which way of life to choose, they want freedom; they have fought hard for it; they want the American way of life. The debate in the minds of the people in India, Asia, and Africa is: Are the American people today ready and willing to accept them as their equals in every respect?

Mr. TRUMAN. We are making every effort to do just what you stated.

Mr. SAUND. I say, if we answer that question in the affirmative, we have nothing to fear.

Mr. TRUMAN. I agree with you 100 percent. You have made a perfect statement on the subject.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Christopher.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Thank you for the privilege to say a few words here, Mr. Chairman. I am not here as a member of this committee.

Mr. TRUMAN. You are my Congressman, though.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I haven't forgotten that.

I am flattered, Mr. President, to be your Congressman and unspeakably glad that you are here today.

Mr. TRUMAN. Thank you.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I am going to tell you right here in public that I always admired you and followed your leadership and in many instances your advice, and I have never had cause to regret it.

I have always supported foreign aid and intend to continue to do so.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think you are right.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Now, as to the amount Congress should appropriate each year, that's a different matter. But I would say that the probabilities are that when the bill is reported to the floor of the House, it will be like it ought to be because the House Appropriations Committee has as its chairman, Hon. Clarence Cannon of Missouri, and as a ranking minority member, Hon. John Taber of New York, than whom there is no more conservative man in the House.

Mr. TRUMAN. I know them both very well.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And those two men and their committee have heard all the evidence pro and con. They will know how much money is needed and they will probably bring to the House an appropriation measure that will be as nearly right as it is humanly possible to make it.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am sure of that.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. My reasons for supporting foreign aid are, as I read history, I can see to look down the tortuous road the human race has followed until the path is lost in the dust and fog of antiquity, and we can see on both sides of that path bleaching skeletons of nations and empires that have been destroyed by avarice and greed seeking

to take over the domination of the entire world, but if there is anyone in this room who can point out the skeleton of a nation along that path that has been destroyed by generosity and human kindness, I'd like to know what nation it was and when it ceased to exist from those causes.

Mr. TRUMAN. There is no such nation.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is the reason I have always supported foreign aid and intend to continue. I realize that we've got to watch the purse strings, and we should.

Mr. TRUMAN. I agree with you.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And while the 5 Eisenhower budgets exceed your last 5 budgets by \$73,760 million, I am not condemning our President, because there have been different developments in the world, and it takes money to run the greatest business on earth today, which is the Government of the United States. It is the greatest business in the world today.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And Washington, D. C., is the capital of the world, and not so by our own design. That responsibility was not sought by us.

Mr. TRUMAN. No.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. It was thrust upon us, and we've got to discharge it to the very best of our ability.

Now, personally, I don't love a big city—maybe I am taking too much time. A lady the other day said to me in Washington, "Isn't Washington beautiful?" I said, "No, lady, it isn't. I will say it is majestic and that it is grand and that it is the capital of the world, but I will not say it is beautiful. I say Azalea Park is beautiful." I said, "A green mountain with a clear stream coming down it, bathed in a gold and purple sunset, is beautiful." I said, "God created that; man created Washington. Let's just say it is majestic and leave it there." She said, "I can see that you are an outdoor man." I said, "You can repeat that as often as you want to."

But, Mr. President, thank you for being here, and I am very much honored, and I am also honored that this heart of America is my congressional district, and I have many friendships and a lot of people here that I love and when I pray—and as ornery as I am I do occasionally—I ask God to make me more worthy of the people of the Fourth District of the State of Missouri.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, Congressman Richard Bolling, your other Congressman from this section, asked me to extend to you his greetings and also to say that he regrets that he could not be here. He took advantage of the Easter recess to go out to Bethesda to have a physical checkup, and for that reason he is not here.

Mr. TRUMAN. I understood that. We have two mighty good Congressmen from this part of the State. There is one of them, and Dick is the other.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Thank you.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. President, I want to make just one brief observation. Having been in Washington only two terms, but having had some previous public experience, I know the truth of the Biblical expression: "A prophet is not without honor save in his own home-

town." Regardless of one's accomplishments and even a recognition of those accomplishments by the world his own people often do not appreciate him. I was prompted by a witness in St. Louis day before yesterday to make a statement which I would like to repeat today in your presence: I believe that the people of America are daily, monthly, and yearly, more and more, coming to understand and appreciate your service to them and your greatness as their President. I sincerely believe—and this belief is also based upon my own feeling and convictions particularly when I think of happenings in recent years—that when the history of your administration and your service as President of the United States is properly written and evaluated, you will be referred to and revered as one of the truly great Presidents of all time.

Mr. TRUMAN. You are very kind, but you embarrass me. You cannot say that about someone until he's dead, and I want to live a long time.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. That is our trouble, Mr. President. We too often wait until people are dead before we say the things that ought to be said while they live. I wanted to say this now.

Mr. TRUMAN. I appreciate that.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Are there further comments from members of the committee?

Again, Mr. President, we want to tell you how honored we are to have had you spend this time with our committee.

Mr. TRUMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, you have been very kind to me, and I highly appreciate it.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The committee will stand adjourned until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, a recess was taken until 2 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p. m., in the Jackson County Court House, Kansas City, Mo., Hon. A. S. J. Carnahan, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The committee will come to order.

Our first witness this afternoon is Mr. Sheskin, Harry Sheskin.

Mr. Sheskin, we are glad to have you. If you do not have a brief statement of personal background for the record would you give us that before you begin your statement?

STATEMENT OF HARRY SHESKIN, REGIONAL PRESIDENT, ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA; CHAIRMAN, ZIONIST COUNCIL OF GREATER KANSAS CITY, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. SHESKIN. Thank you, gentlemen, I will be very happy to.

I am Harry Sheskin, a lawyer. I had my formal education here in Kansas City and at the Kansas City School of Law and Kansas University, also at the Junior College here prior to that, and I am a member of the Zionist Organization of America in the capacity of regional president, which covers five States, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and all of Illinois with the exception of the city of Chicago. I am also chairman of the Zionist Council of Greater Kansas City, which is composed of all Zionist groups in this area, and I am

a member of the national executive council of the Zionist Organization of America. I am not an employee of any of these organizations. I am also a member of the board and one of the founders of the adult School of Jewish Studies of Greater Kansas City, and we have a Jewish community setup here known as the Jewish Federation and Council of Greater Kansas City of which I have been a vice president and am a member of its board of governors.

I belong to a number of other organizations which represent communal, religious, and fraternal organizations, Masonic and others.

I am a member of the program committee of the Kansas City Bar Association. Is that sufficient?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is sufficient.

Mr. SHESKIN. I wish to talk about our foreign aid policy and program in relation to the Middle East because that is the vital area of the world to which the cold war has been shifted. That is where we now face the Soviet Union for control in our struggle for the understanding and cooperation of the not yet fully committed peoples; and our foreign policy will determine our victory or defeat. If we lose the Middle East to the Soviets, we may well have lost Africa and Asia, and democracy will be really locked in a desperate life-or-death struggle with totalitarianism, and that will mean a hot war for existence which will cost us many times what foreign aid in a cold war is costing us today.

Our firm stands in the past, backed with swift action, such as in Korea, on Matsu and Quemoy, and right now in the moving of the Sixth Fleet into the troubled area of the Middle East, indicating a firm stand again, gave the Soviets pause, and I believe will in this instance, but unfortunately an arms race was started in the Middle East and gave them an excuse to infiltrate that area and to pour more arms into it than could ever be used for the trumped-up charge of aggressive and expansionist plans by democratic Israel, which wishes only to be left in peace to develop its economy and provide for its people. The real purpose of Soviet arms in the Middle East is not to strengthen democracy but to strangle it.

A war between the Arab States and democratic Israel is not inevitable. Although our past actions, as they have developed, indicate that that was our approach to the problem, it is most unfortunate that we regard it so; and that, consequently, we have emphasized a military approach to the Middle East problems; and that military approach has involved appeasement and compromise, a course which I deeply believe is beneath the dignity of our great Nation, a course which history has always proved to be very, very futile and dangerous and has led to war, a course which a ruthless Soviet interprets as weakness and exploits as a weakness in us; and that course does no justice to us in the eyes of our present allies nor to those allies whom we seek and whom we need.

The Arab States are not united, not invincible and not beyond recall to a peaceful solution to the problems of the area. The overwhelming majority of the population are illiterate and economically depressed; dangerous breeding ground for Communist intrigue.

To win the area, preserve world peace and promote democracy, our foreign aid policy for the Middle East requires a bold and imaginative shift in emphasis from military aid to economic aid and a mutual security program to implement the latter.

The area is desperately in need of water, water for irrigation and for power, electrical power for industry, of course. Water for the land and the people is as important as oil for the rulers. An aggressive implementation of the Johnson plan for water for the benefit of all the peoples in this area will do more to strengthen democracy than the arms which can only help intriguing rulers.

A bold swift program of building large oil tankers and of pipelines such as the one from Eilat on the Gulf of Aqaba across Israel to the Mediterranean and the vigorous development of atomic energy for peaceful uses can do more to weaken and overthrow or to bring to their senses rulers bent on personal power at the expense of their people and of world peace, and can do so more cheaply and more effectively, than a hot war which is the inevitable result of military emphasis alone.

Such a program will indeed require a great outlay of money, but it is the surest and cheapest path to peace and democracy because it is the positive and constructive approach to assuring security for peoples, which is the foundation for peace. We must remain strong; but we cannot indefinitely spend for destruction. That path leads down the road to slavery. Our people will not complain if they see their dollars, wisely husbanded, buying the tools which will help peoples to bring themselves to the point where, in a free world, dividends will come back to us; and I don't mean dollars and cents.

It has been cynically said that—

The world is in the hands of leaders who are giants in moralizing and pygmies in action confronting other leaders who are delinquents in morality and gangsters in action (Max Lerner, New York Post).

Let the policy of our great Nation, for the sake of all humanity and for its own preservation spare no money to act as a moral giant in defeating ruthless gangsters.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Sheskin.

Mr. SHESKIN. There is appended a list of the organizations for which I speak. It was impossible to contact all of the organizations with whom I have contact. I mean by all, others not listed there with whom I have had contact on the local and national level, and who I feel heartily endorse the statement which I have just made.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Do you wish the additional statement included as a part of the record with your statement?

Mr. SHESKIN. If you will, please.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Without objection it will be done.

(The additional statement referred to follows:)

The following individuals join Harry Sheskin in his statement before the House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting in Kansas City on Monday, April 29.

Time did not permit clearance of this statement through the boards of the organizations which these persons represent, but the sentiments expressed by Mr. Sheskin are substantially those of the organizations.

Mrs. Arvia Goldstein, 7431 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo., president of Hadassah with five local groups in Kansas City.

Jack Bohm, 7236 Madison, Kansas City, Mo., president B'nai B'rith Council with 8 chapters and lodges in Kansas City.

Mrs. Lipman G. Feld, 607 West 58th Terrace, Kansas City, Mo., president of the Kansas City section of the National Council of Jewish Women.

Chester B. Kaplan, 1015 Dierks Building, Kansas City, Mo., commander of the Missouri State department, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

Abe J. Kaplan, 4764 Broadway, Kansas City, Mo., chairman, Jewish Community Relations Bureau of Greater Kansas City.

Ben N. Allmayer, 9407 Madison, Kansas City, Mo., president, Kansas City Zionist district.

Mr. SHESKIN. I spoke, for example, this afternoon, in the absence of the president of the Rabbinical Association of Kansas City, which represents all of the Jewish congregations in Kansas City, with one of our rabbis, and read him the statement and he said, in the absence of the president who is in Toronto, Canada, he cannot speak for the entire Rabbinical Association properly, but he heartily approves my statement, and felt, as a former president and in close contact with his colleagues, that they will do likewise.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Sheskin, in your statement on the second page you say we must remain strong. I presume, then, that you favor necessary expenditures for defense?

Mr. SHESKIN. Absolutely. And when I say we must remain strong, I have the Soviet Union in my mind; but when I say that we should deemphasize military assistance and increase our emphasis upon economic aid, I have in mind the Middle East, because I don't feel that additional military aid in that area of the world does any good for the peoples themselves; and I mean that we should spend all these funds in our overall military establishment to remain strong, because only by being strong, and in addition to that, by adopting and following through the firmest possible attitude without quibbling or equivocation or varying from side to side, expediently doing this at one moment and something else at another, can we possibly maintain the leadership that we have and the respect of the uncommitted world.

Mr. CARNAHAN. And you continue to say but we cannot indefinitely spend for destruction.

Mr. SHESKIN. I think that is academic, as a philosophical approach, that we must try to force our greatest antagonists by every means possible to a conclusion of this destructive arms race, which is costing the billions of dollars that could otherwise go to the assistance of the men throughout the world who need that assistance, particularly the underdeveloped countries.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Then, you feel that, if we must continue for a time to spend for strength or for defense, we must not neglect encouraging peoples throughout the world to build a type of life for themselves which they will defend?

Mr. SHESKIN. Not for one moment, because it is for the benefit of our own preservation that we do that. We cannot live in a world, as Lincoln said, "half slave, half free."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You have emphasized the importance of economic aid very clearly and very well, and you have spoken about the military approach. Would you or would you not want one to conclude from the way you have spoken of the military and the economic aid that you don't think the Eisenhower doctrine is a proper policy for the Middle East?

Mr. SHESKIN. A forthright answer is that I would not conclude that it is not a proper policy. It is a proper first step.

Mr. MERROW. Yes.

Mr. SHESKIN. And it is very necessary vis-a-vis the Soviet. But I wish to emphasize again that the Arab States do not need more arms, only sufficient arms for police force, to maintain peace in the

area but not arms which they can only use in another round against Israel. But the Eisenhower policy is not a do all nor say all; it is, as I say, a first step and should be followed up by the economic aid and by other things which I have suggested.

Mr. MERROW. I am glad you clarified that because you were speaking about the action of the Sixth Fleet, in which I was interested to hear you make a comment in that respect.

Mr. SHESKIN. I am very happy to see the United States take a firm stand in this instance by ordering the Sixth Fleet, not as a threat of aggression on our part, for destruction or war, but to let the Soviet know that they dare not take another step in the direction of disrupting the peace of that part of the world and must stop the intrigue which is roiling the troubled waters at this moment.

Mr. MERROW. Is it correct that you do not feel the amount of money proposed for mutual assistance is excessive?

Mr. SHESKIN. I do not feel that the amount is excessive. To be practical and realistic about it we will have to spend a great deal more; and the great deal more, plus this amount, will be much less than what a war will cost us if we do not continue aid; but I do say that three things should be done: I think that the peoples for whom we are spending that money should be made aware that we are doing that through an intensified and aggressive activity on the part of the United States Information Agency, and other means. I think that we should simply not throw our money out without some strings attached as to what it is going for and whom it is going to.

There is a great proportion of our population who raise their eyebrows and wonder at the legitimacy of giving a loan of \$2 million to King Saud of Saudi Arabia when he has an oil income of a reported \$300 million a year; and when they know 90 percent goes to his private use and only 10 percent for the use of the people of his country; so I think we have a perfect right without trying to impose our will upon those peoples. They must be permitted to be free to develop their economy and their way of government, be free to do so, but along the lines that we emphasize democracy; democracy, as they see it; peace and freedom as they see it, without harm to others; that is important.

I think also, with reference to that spending of money, that our own people should have it explained. I think I have covered the three things: that the people there should know what it is about, that we should have the kind of strings attached to it assuring that it does not go down the drain; and that the people here should be more forthrightly informed about the life and death need for this spending.

Mr. MERROW. Once I believe you said that this is a two-way street and to term what we are doing as a "giveaway" is not giving the picture clearly.

Mr. SHESKIN. It is only because that picture has not been made clear that the people think it is a one-way street. Of course it is a two-way street. It is protection, too.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I wonder if we might go to the next witness; we have several to hear, and then we will share the questioning with the other folks at the table.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SHESKIN. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Our next witness is Mrs. Bowker.

Do you have a prepared statement?

Mrs. BOWKER. No; I do not have a prepared statement.

Mr. CARNAHAN. If you will give us a brief statement of background for the record, and proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF MRS. BETRENIA BOWKER, CHAIRMAN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, KANSAS CITY BRANCH OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mrs. BOWKER. My name is Betrenia Bowker. I am a Missourian. I am international relations chairman at the Kansas City branch of the American Association of University Women. Our membership is about 630. An average of 50 women meet for almost all day, once a month, to study foreign affairs, particularly our foreign policy as it relates to other sections of the world.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Are you speaking for the club or are you speaking as an individual?

Mrs. BOWKER. I did not have time to circulate a prepared statement and get the approval of enough members of the group so that I would be comfortable submitting a statement from the group. I would be happy to speak as an individual.

Mr. CARNAHAN. You may proceed.

Mrs. BOWKER. I will make this opening statement for the group, because in the 2 years that I have been chairman I have not been able to detect any anti-foreign-aid sentiment. The very fact that the group as a whole is interested in international affairs makes them internationalist in outlook, and all of us are in favor of foreign aid, but we do think that a frequent reappraisal is wise. Maybe now I had better shift to personal opinion.

I noticed your questioning this morning. I would be distressed if foreign aid is cut. I will be distressed if the USIA funds are cut, because I couldn't agree more than with the witness just before me that regardless of what our actions are, what they seem to be is more important to strangers than what they are. And while I, as an American citizen, am sure that the presence of our 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean has no evil motive behind it, if I were an Egyptian—or maybe even a Turk—I might very easily believe, might easily accept, the picture of the American bully. So I think that a very strong USIA program is necessary along with our expenditures for foreign aid.

One more thing that I, as a person, as a citizen, would like to see is a complete separation of the funds—and publication of this information at intervals—complete separation of the economic and military funds under what we now call mutual security program. It seems to me that Mr. Dulles should not have to defend the expenditure of military funds and likewise the military men shouldn't have to defend the expenditure of economic and information funds.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mrs. Bowker.

We will continue down the list so I will start with you, Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. You made a very good statement, brief and to the point. I want to commend you.

I want to ask you simply for the record, how does your club operate? How do you get information to your club in your efforts to inform and encourage your members to think upon these matters?

Mrs. BOWKER. I will make one background statement. It is an international federation of university women; it is multiracial and has

national associations in 48 countries. The American Association of University Women is our national organization. There are State organizations and there are regional organizations, and then there are what we call local branches. Our local branch, as I mentioned before, has six-hundred-thirty-some members, so we operate on a system of study groups. A person may be a member of AAUW and if her interest is specifically international relations, she goes to that group and that is actually her club activity. We may go to a series of groups within the club. Most of us do. Our international relations program is set up on this format. Four of our members each month do what we hope is a very thorough study and it almost always is of a specific field in foreign relations. A great many of us spend as much time preparing a panel discussion once a month as we ordinarily spend on a semester's work in college. The four women each month present a morning panel discussion. If you gentlemen are in town Wednesday we would be delighted to have you come for our panel on NATO. "Is it falling apart or is it not?" is our question for Wednesday morning. Then we will have lunch, to which you are also invited. In the afternoon we have an invited speaker. One of our members from the Netherlands is available this month and will speak on education in Holland.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. In other words, your programs are so arranged and the questions which you are asked to discuss are so prepared that every point of view is expressed and everyone has an opportunity to express his own point of view?

Mrs. BOWKER. Always. There is always a thorough open hearing after every panel discussion so if there may be any feeling in the group that the whole picture has not been presented, any individual member asks questions, and the panel, insofar as they are prepared, answer.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. It sounds like a mighty good, worthwhile organization.

Mrs. BOWKER. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

Mrs. Bowker, you made a short, concise statement that we can all understand. I have few questions, if any.

Did I understand you to say that you had some misgivings about the purpose of the 6th fleet in the eastern Mediterranean?

Mrs. BOWKER. No; I have none personally. I said, as an American citizen I have no misgivings about its being there, but if I were an Egyptian or a Turk, I can see how I might be taken in by the "bully" propaganda.

Mr. LECOMPTE. You might be led to believe that the threat had no purpose?

Mrs. BOWKER. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If you were over in that country and a native of that country and not an American?

Mrs. BOWKER. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you, you made a nice statement.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mrs. Bowker, did you hear the statement by the League of Women Voters' representative?

Mrs. BOWKER. No.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I want to join my colleagues in saying that you have presented a helpful statement.

You feel that this view is fairly representative of the women of this area?

Mrs. BOWKER. I am afraid I would be presumptuous to answer that either "Yes" or "No". I am afraid I just don't know enough women.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. You are trying to reach the community and to influence its thinking?

Mrs. BOWKER. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Outside of the university group?

Mrs. BOWKER. Yes; we join with any community efforts in this field. As international relations chairman I have served on, I would say, probably 6 community committees in the 2 years that I have been chairman. That is how I met the League representative here, we worked together on a series of panels. We had three radio panels on the Middle East. I won't go any further on that, she may want to tell us.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mrs. Davis made the statement and——

Mrs. BOWKER. Excuse me, I missed Mrs. Davis' appearance; I am sorry.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It seems to me that your point of view is pretty much the same.

Have you had occasion to talk about the relative advantages of bilateral aid and multilateral aid, to what extent aid might be channeled through the United Nations and auxiliary agencies?

Mrs. BOWKER. Yes. Our March panel was on international agencies, including those that weren't strictly U. N. agencies, such as the World Bank. Now, here again I may be presuming a little, but I think that I am safe in saying that it is the opinion of the group that every avenue should be tried. We are strong for trade in addition to aid. We are strong for loans through the World Bank where it is feasible. I would particularly like to see the Organization for Trade Cooperation a growing factor.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Approval of the United Nations agencies and related agencies would not imply that the others are disapproved?

Mrs. BOWKER. That is right.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The two can be paralleling each other.

Mrs. BOWKER. Also not too great a dependence on the United Nations as a substitute for our own foreign policy.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund.

Mr. SAUND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Bowker, each one of us heard extensive hearings on the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine, and after weeks of listening to the testimony we unanimously reported in favor of the President's request for the resolution. I am quite certain that your group must have discussed that while the discussion was on or afterward. Do you approve the Eisenhower Doctrine?

Mrs. BOWKER. Here again, if I may, I will have to speak as a person. I approve of the Eisenhower Doctrine. I think it is good as a first step, as another witness said, but I might say I was delighted by the Senate debate on it. Sometimes a citizen's only source for what I consider valid information comes through senatorial debate and questions.

Mr. SAUND. Let me ask the question. We, and I think I speak for the other members as well as myself, are working for the people of the

United States in this particular department. We like to find out what they think about what we do. After listening to the gentleman who preceded you, and to the testimony of all others, I am of the opinion that the United States must be made to feel that Israel is there to stay. We listened to experts, generals, the Secretary of State, and we came to the conclusion that it was necessary for us to grant the request of the President for him to be able to give the \$200 million wherever he thought it was necessary. We also knew that maybe all of that money or the major portion of that money would go to the Arabian countries, and we approved that with this understanding, that the most important need at the time was to save the Middle East from falling under the influence of communism, international communism. Now, do you approve of that? If you are satisfied in your mind that if we did not help those countries at a certain time there was danger of international communism taking over, and under those circumstances, even if we have to give money to some who we know would not spend it wisely or for good purpose, would you approve of that?

Mrs. BOWKER. I am afraid I have come to the conclusion that you cannot conduct a big financial program without some waste.

Mr. SAUND. In other words, the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Congress of the United States approved the Eisenhower Doctrine because it will ultimately result in keeping peace in the East, no matter where we have to spend that money?

Mrs. BOWKER. I think the fact that the Senate debated it carefully means that the funds will be spent more wisely. With senatorial questioning—by senatorial I mean congressional, of course.

Mr. SAUND. That is all.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. BOWKER. May I add, with emphasis, my hope that administrators of the Eisenhower Doctrine are convinced, and remain convinced, that the fountainhead of international communism is in Moscow and only in Moscow.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The next witness is Mr. Stuber.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY I. STUBER, GENERAL SECRETARY, COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF GREATER KANSAS CITY, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. STUBER. Mr. Chairman, at the end of the statement you will find a brief personal review.

At the present time I am general secretary of the Council of Churches of the Greater Kansas City area. I was director of World Relief for the American Baptist Convention for several years after World War II, director of promotion for Church World Service, which is a branch of the National Council of Churches, and I have also served as general secretary for the International Christian University in Japan.

I am speaking this afternoon as an individual, although I am sure that the 230 churches of the Council of Churches perhaps would without exception or almost without exception support me in what I am about to say.

One of the great unifying factors of the various denominations during the past few years has been their cooperative world relief program

through Church World Service. They have also united in a vast refugee resettlement service through the same organization. They have recently gone on record, as members of the National Council of Churches, in support of the United States foreign aid program.

This has been in keeping with their world mission endeavor, which has sought not only to save the souls of men, but also to free their minds, heal their bodies, undergird their economy, and help create a society in which the Christian spirit of brotherhood, liberty, and the worth of the individual person may live abundantly and creatively.

In supporting the foreign-aid program, we separate the economic aspects of it from the military. We are not committing ourselves to any kind of military aid, although we admit the fact that some kind of mutual defense, in this kind of a world, is necessary. We do not, moreover, bless the foreign-aid program blindly or 100 percent. We believe that it should be planned carefully and administered with the least possible waste of personnel and funds. We do not believe that the mere giving away of large funds automatically creates friends for this Nation. Quite the opposite may be the final result.

While we have a humanitarian and religious motivation for supporting economic foreign aid, we are not unmindful of the fact that it is also a good business venture on an international scale. This is borne out by the fact that recently the Committee for Economic Development, composed of hard-headed businessmen and economists, have come out in favor of continuing this program. In a 37-page document, just released, it states that it is convinced that sound policy calls for an upward revision of our aid to the undeveloped countries of the world, and with particular stress upon the so-called uncommitted countries. This coming from the CED cannot be passed off lightly as being merely idealistic, impractical, and global-minded. These members are realistic, and have the future of our Nation at heart.

We also believe that international friendship, supported by grants, loans, and technical assistance, can help to make the peace. In fact, we believe that we will increasingly be weighted down with unbearable armament burdens, until we can create through mutual cooperation, understanding, and sharing a strong bond of unity among all peace-loving nations. It is in this area of peacemaking, of mutual respect, of world brotherhood, that we cast our lot for foreign aid.

Our position is summed up in this letter which we recently sent to the New York Times (printed in the Sunday edition, April 28, 1957):

EDITOR,

The New York Times,
Times Square, New York, N. Y.

SIR: It will be easy for an economy minded Congress to cut the proposed budget now under discussion at those points not covered by hard-hitting lobbyists who are at present so evident in Washington. Farm, military, and veteran interests will be well taken care of by these able advocates. But who will represent the refugees of the world who need our help? Who will represent, from various nations, the technical and economic foreign-aid programs which are so essential to the peace and well-being of the world?

Foreign aid is now coming in for a great deal of criticism. From my point of view this criticism has not only been ill-founded, but does not take into consideration the tremendous value this Nation derives from this relatively small investment in economic and technical aid. Outside of the direct benefits such as raising the standard of living, there are many indirect benefits which help to create the atmosphere in which world peace may be developed.

It will clarify matters if we can have a clean-cut separation between foreign military aid and the funds used for economic and technical aid purposes in

foreign lands. It will also help to have these administered separately.

There is real merit in Secretary Dulles' recent proposal that economic and technical aid be established on a long-term basis, using, in the main, loans instead of grants. This would allow for careful planning and the money would be returned to this country in time with multiplied interest.

Church people, largely because of the extensive world relief and refugee programs of the National Council and the World Council of Churches, have become very concerned over helping people in less fortunate areas. The General Board of the National Council has gone on record as follows: (1) America should assist our fellowmen in underdeveloped areas through public and private mutual-aid programs that are designed to help people help themselves; (2) technical cooperation programs should be increased and available funds be provided; (3) foreign trade should be increased; and (4) there should be long-range planning in foreign aid.

If we really want to promote world peace, international understanding, and good will, I know of no better way of doing it than through a sensible, creative program of foreign economic and technical aid. We are forced to spend billions for military "defense."

Is it a waste of money to invest a few million dollars in the making of peace? It is my firm conviction that the American people, once they see this whole picture clearly, will support a foreign-aid program which they will then realize is no longer "foreign," but for the mutual benefit of every single member of the human race, both here and abroad.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Stuber, you say we have not committed ourselves to any kind of military aid. Do you say that in the sense that you are opposed to the military aid?

Mr. STUBER. No, Mr. Chairman, not necessarily. In thinking of this problem we were steering clear of getting involved in any military discussion because we don't feel that we are experts in that field at all. We feel that we do know something about refugee problems, relief, and something of economic aid.

Mr. CARNAHAN. You say it because you believe that your field is economic and technical assistance?

Mr. STUBER. That is right. We state here that we feel for the time being that we have to have a certain amount of military aid on a mutual basis.

Mr. CARNAHAN. In the proposed mutual security program for the coming year it was proposed that we should spend \$4.4 billion on the entire program, \$1.9 billions was for economic and technical assistance, including military support. Now, if you wring all of the military support out of it, you would come out with about a half billion dollars. Do you feel that that is an excessive amount for us to be spending to improve the living conditions of people throughout the world?

Mr. STUBER. I do not. In fact, I feel that it is too small actually to meet the economic and relief problems facing the various nations of the world.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Do you feel our people understand the situation when they say or probably believe that we could perhaps balance the budget, reduce expenditures, by cutting foreign aid, especially the economic and technical assistance?

Mr. STUBER. I believe that they do not understand the total implications. Merely by cutting foreign aid, especially the economic features of it, certainly wouldn't balance the budget because it would be a relatively small amount, as you indicate, a half billion dollars. In fact, the budget can be balanced if the estimated income comes through as indicated at the present time.

I do think that there is a misunderstanding in regard to the amount of money being spent by the Government on strictly economic aid. I think it is so mixed up with military aid that the general public finds

it quite impossible to separate the two. I think it would be helpful, at least from my point of view, to break it down in such a way that the public can see how small an amount, relatively small amount, is going strictly for economic aid.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STUBER. I compliment you on a very lucid and forthright statement in reference to matters of foreign policy. Many of the questions I had in mind have been answered. Do you not think it is an injustice to this program to continually label it as a "giveaway" program, which is so frequently done?

Mr. STUBER. Yes, I think that is a very false label. I know that there are books on the market at the present time on a public basis and articles being written using the title "Give-Away." I think it is very misleading, because, as has been brought out here several times during the day, it is a two-way proposition; we get as much or probably more in return than we invest. I would call it an investment program rather than a give-away program.

Mr. MERROW. In view of the difficulties which exist throughout the world you feel that we have a definite obligation to do what we can within our capability to alleviate these various conditions?

Mr. STUBER. Yes; I certainly do. As we pointed out, we should do it carefully, with planning, and with no waste. I think the whole program should be reexamined so there will be as little waste as possible. There is some possibility of misusing funds in any large program, but I think it could be controlled very carefully and well.

Mr. MERROW. You say at the beginning of your statement that although you are speaking as an individual you feel sure that 230 of the churches of the Council of Churches would almost without exception support the position that you have set forth. Would you be so kind as to elaborate a little so that it would be perfectly clear why you feel that way, because it is a large number of people for whom you are speaking.

Mr. STUBER. That is right. I qualified my statement because we did not have time to place it before a formal committee meeting. I say that the churches, almost without exception, would support the statement that I made because in all of their denominations, and we have 23 denominations representing our council, all of these denominations have gone on record in their annual meetings as supporting this program of foreign aid. Therefore, the individual church is committed, more or less. They are not absolutely bound in all cases, but if the national body has adopted a program it means that the individual churches in the large are supporting that program.

Another thing is that, as I mentioned, the National Council of Churches has gone on record for this program and I believe they will go on record again this week when they meet in Chicago. All of these churches except for one area, the Southern Baptist, belong to the National Council, so I'd say there again it ties into the whole picture. The Southern Baptist have their own foreign relief program, and being a Baptist myself and knowing the church, I feel very strongly that they would go along with these general principles that I have enunciated this afternoon.

Mr. MERROW. Your testimony has been most helpful.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Stuber, you made a very good statement. We in Congress have a very difficult job. Even though we may agree with you and with others, we are responsible to the people who elected us.

Mr. STUBER. That is right.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. We are spending our own as well as somebody else's money. Do you have any comments on what we might do or should do or plan to do with respect to our national debt and a possible reduction in taxes?

Mr. STUBER. Of course that's a question that comes very close to home to all of us because we are all interested in keeping down the national debt. It would seem to me that there are certain other issues that come before the national debt. One is mutual defense, which includes this whole area of foreign aid. I see no way of cutting down the national debt until we can cut down military aid. That is the biggest item, the billions of dollars that we have to put into national defense. I think that the best way to relieve the entire national tension which makes us develop more and more the military program, is through foreign aid and mutual understanding, all the good will that we can create. Therefore as we create a basis, an atmosphere, world atmosphere, of understanding and good will we can cut down our amounts for national defense and therefore sometime in the near future, I hope, it will permit us to have a chance to reduce our national debt.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I asked that question because I think there are many groups in this country and many people, who, as our national income increases, will want to continue to add to our contributions under a mutual security program at a time when maybe we ought to reduce our national debt and the tax load of our people. We must show some concern for our own people in America who are paying this bill. If our own people do not themselves prosper, they cannot help others.

Mr. STUBER. That is correct. We must also think of the increase in the national income because at the same time one balances against the other.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Dr. Stuber, I am particularly happy to see you. I have been happy to be with you and, being a Baptist myself, I enjoyed your comment on that.

I wonder if your group has had occasion to study some of the questions that have confronted us, such as the desirability of a loan as distinguished from a grant program and the relative merits of bilateral and multilateral approaches.

Mr. STUBER. This is rather new in our thinking. It has developed very largely, I think, from Secretary Dulles' presentation a week or so ago pointing out the fact that the program in the future might be promoted more on a loan basis than a grant basis. As I have indicated here, I think it has great merit and I think it will increasingly gain the favor of denominational groups. We do not feel that merely giving money accomplishes what we are after in helping people to help themselves. If we can have certain loans which they can pay back over a period of years then we feel that it will not only be helping them

but we will be helping our own Nation to recover funds and in turn reduce the national debt. I think there is great merit in that idea of loans, and we will increasingly be concerned about it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Now, the other part of the question, multi-lateral against bilateral. This is directed to the question of Mr. Fountain. Here it seems to me there are two possibilities of offering some lessening of the burden, in other words, as we invite other nations, the industrial nations as distinguished from the undeveloped nations, to share in the program of development, extending capital goods and investment, we tend to minimize this burden, to reduce it rather.

Mr. STUBER. I feel that we haven't done a very good job in public relations at this point, because, as we know, many nations share in some of these programs, economic programs, not only directly but especially through the United Nations. The churches have been concerned to work through the United Nations as far as possible, not to exclude some direct aid in technical assistance, to be sure, but in the main we would favor working through the United Nations in some of these world problems, refugee relief and economic aid.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund.

Mr. SAUND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Stuber, we always hear this statement, and it is a true statement, that you cannot buy friends. But from your connection with the missionaries—and I know the Baptists have many missionaries all over the world, you are connected with them—do you find that even though we cannot buy friends, that we do assist the undeveloped countries in improving their conditions, medically in the case of malaria and other diseases, or helping them establish themselves economically. Do we make friends?

Mr. STUBER. A large part of our missionary program is medical aid, education, technical assistance. A part of it is evangelism, but more and more we are putting stress upon these other help programs and I think that is especially true in India. Mr. Nehru not too long ago praised the missionary movement for this part of the program which really helps to develop the economy and the educational forces of the countries where these missionaries serve. I know that many of our colleges, especially what we call union colleges, where several denominations share together in maintaining the college, are now built on a basis of helping people in the country to learn more about agriculture, for example, scientific insights, and the whole program of being of mutual help. I think that we are entering into a new phase of missionary work, and some of these items that you have mentioned will be increasingly large in the new type of missionary program which we are developing at the present time.

Mr. SAUND. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Dr. Stuber.

Mrs. LYNE. If you do not have it in your statement, will you give us just a brief statement of your background?

**STATEMENT OF MRS. THOMAS LYNE, LEAGUE OF WOMEN
VOTERS OF SHAWNEE MISSION, PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KANS.**

Mrs. LYNE. Yes. There isn't anything in my statement.

I am a Kansas housewife. I am a graduate of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in Massachusetts. I have served on the staffs of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in New York and the World Peace Foundation in Boston, and here in Kansas City I am a member of the World Affairs Council and International Relations Council as well as a member of the League of Women Voters.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mrs. Lyne.

Mrs. LYNE. The Shawnee Mission League of Women Voters of Kansas welcomes the opportunity to present its views on foreign policy to the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. While these views may be repetitive of other testimony presented by Leagues of Women Voters this very repetition demonstrates that all policies endorsed by the League are of grassroots origin and a true reflection of the views of the rank and file membership, some 126,000 women, of whom the Shawnee Mission Kansas League comprises 125.

The League has long recognized the interdependence of the nations of the world. The United States industries require worldwide markets and raw materials from all parts of the globe. Our security system depends on farflung bases. We are dependent on the rest of the world for our well-being, both economically and politically. Conversely, any policy or action undertaken by the United States has worldwide repercussions. Therefore, the League believes that collective action and cooperation among nations provide the best means for solving world problems. Consistent with this view the League has endorsed United States participation in the United Nations, its Specialized Agencies, and in regional defense pacts. We feel the United Nations system provides the best opportunity now in existence for exercising the collective approach to international problems and that it should be utilized and developed wherever possible.

The principle of economic interdependence is one with which the League has been particularly concerned. Not only has the League advocated U. N. membership by which we pledge, under articles 55 and 56—

joint and separate action with the Organization for achievement of * * * conditions of economic and social progress and development—

but endorsed foreign aid programs and measures for a more liberal trade policy by the United States.

The League has supported United States foreign aid programs since the inception of the Marshall plan. Today we recognize the increasingly important roles that the newly created and emerging states in the Afro-Asian areas of the world are playing, not just in the United Nations, but in world politics in general. Therefore the League urges the United States to continue foreign aid programs in an effort to make lesser developed countries economically viable. It is hoped that such economic viability would bring political stability.

The League has also urged the adoption of more liberal trade policies by the United States. Not only would a lessening of trade barriers encourage economic ties tending to bring the uncommitted areas of the world further into the Western sphere of influence, but would strengthen the free world as well. Our own economy would benefit too with

broadier markets and greater access to essential raw materials. The League feels that the total United States economy is not served by higher tariffs or quotas. Rather we endorse the use of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. We also urge congressional approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation in order to provide the necessary international organization with secretariat functions for the negotiating parties of GATT.

In summary, the Shawnee Mission League of Women Voters joins the other League chapters throughout the country in endorsing the following view on foreign policy: Continued support and use of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies; continued use of regional defense arrangements; continued foreign aid in the forms of economic aid and technical assistance; continued efforts for a more liberal United States trade policy.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mrs. Lyne.

Would you care to comment in regard to whether the mutual assistance program is a giveaway or an investment?

Mrs. LYNE. I would love to comment. I would like to make my comment as an individual, and, please, not as a representative of the League.

As you realize, the League takes no stand on any policy which it has not studied from the grassroots all the way up through the levels of the League and has arrived at a definite opinion.

I would say this is not a giveaway program, gentlemen; this is a real investment for the United States.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you for your statement, Mrs. Lyne.

In the first paragraph you state that "all policies endorsed by the League are of grassroots origin" and that they represent some 126,000 women, I suppose throughout the country, and your chapter here has 125.

Mrs. LYNE. Yes.

Mr. MERROW. I wish, if you will, please, you would describe for us just the procedure of getting the results on these various issues so that it bears out the statement that you have made that it is of grassroot origin in the League.

Mrs. LYNE. All subjects chosen for study by the League are chosen at a national convention (composed of delegates representing Leagues from all areas). Then the local League itself spends 2 years studying this national program. Some materials come from the national office; much of it is gathered by the individual members themselves, who present the programs. Members discuss the programs, ask questions and then find areas of agreement on a local level, the areas where they feel they can agree. These areas of agreement are sent to the State organization where a State report is compiled, and those reports are turned over to the national office. Then the consensus, as it is called, is passed down again from the same organizations and to the individual members.

Mr. MERROW. You have seen the recommendations of the President to the effect that perhaps mutual security aid in the military can be reduced by about \$500 million, leaving about \$3.9 billion for all foreign aid for the next fiscal year. Do you think that \$4 billion is excessive against what is being spent for our own defense?

Mrs. LYNE. No, sir; I do not, and I don't believe the League does either. It has wanted this technical aid to continue, particularly in areas needing long-range or long-term development. The League is particularly concerned that these long-range programs not be neglected under the pressure of the existing times; it feels that this is a real investment, and that the long-range development programs should not be foreshortened or abbreviated because there is pressure exerted in another area where the aid is more needed at the moment.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Just for the record, will you tell us what type or kind of economic aid or technical assistance you have in mind we ought to give to underdeveloped countries and others who are in need?

Mrs. LYNE. Technical assistance, as I understand it, and I think as it has been promoted to the other League members, it is more the sharing of know-how, skills, or procedures for crop rotation, fertilization, irrigation, and that sort of thing. I remember particularly one instance of technical assistance in India where some of our technical assistants went in, or was it under the U. N. expanded program—I am not sure which—and saw that they were using a straight-stick plow, and that by using another type of plowshare on the same plow they could improve the procedure, and the assistants showed them how to do this. That, to me, is technical assistance. Economic aid is the actual development of an irrigation system, building a power plant, providing seed, hybrid seed, for crops, that sort of expenditure. With one, I think, you provide the actual goods with the services that you give, and the other is a sharing of skills and knowledge.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I think you have given a very good and brief explanation of what they both are. I think it is good for us all to know what we mean and for others to know what we mean when we use the terms.

That is all.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Your statement is quite comprehensive. I don't think I have any questions. I was going to comment only to this extent: that as far as trade agreements go, this committee has no jurisdiction.

Mrs. LYNE. I understand that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mrs. Lyne, has your group, in pursuing this matter of more liberal trade policies, considered whether or not we should change our trade policies in the Orient with Red China, for example; have you gotten into that field? You mentioned the Afro-Asian.

Mrs. LYNE. No, sir; they have not studied that aspect of the foreign trade, as far as I know. This conclusion was made in 1954 at the conclusion of a 2-year study, and the recommendations made then were more toward the reduction of tariffs, the elimination of peril-point procedures, and elimination of quota systems rather than the countries with which we should trade.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Have you taken a look at the handling of surplus goods and the distribution to needy nations in that respect?

Mrs. LYNE. That, as far as I know, was also not a part of it. We would rather see the procedures established whereby the trade came through natural channels as equitably as it could.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is all.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund.

Mr. SAUND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You talk about India. I understand that the Communists have a very extensive propaganda program in India and other countries. I know about India; that they send millions of copies of pamphlets about communism, and then they give those to the Communist blocs in India free of charge; and they are sold in the country at very cheap prices. Everybody buys them who is within their reach, and that is how they propagandize. Do you think that the money that we have been spending on the United Nations and United States Information Agency was too large or too small, or is it an important factor in winning the hearts and minds of those people in those countries to sell them on another way of life? Has your organization thought of that?

Mrs. LYNE. The League has taken no stand that I know of on the procedures and the programs of the United States Information Agency. However, if I could again speak strictly as an individual, I would say I endorse heartily the expenditures for the United States Information Agency, and what I have seen of the work and the programs were excellent, and they do a fine job in trying to show or help these people abroad understand exactly what it is we are and are doing.

If I may make a personal observation here——

Mr. SAUND. Yes.

Mrs. LYNE. I worked with students studying international relations. One time the Voice of America came to me and said, "Let us have some tape recordings of your student discussions at this conference which we can play for students abroad to let them know that the students in the United States are also concerned with international relations and the feelings of peoples of other countries." This we did. The Voice seemed to think that this kind of a people-to-people broadcast would contribute to a greater understanding of the real objectives and the real feelings of the people of the United States. I feel this is what can best be disseminated abroad.

Mr. SAUND. That is all.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you.

Mrs. LYNE. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Potter.

Would you give us a brief personal background statement for the record?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM I. POTTER, ATTORNEY, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. POTTER. I will, Mr. Chairman.

My name is William I. Potter. I am a native of Missouri, educated at William Jewell College and the University of Missouri. I have practiced law in Kansas City for 35 years.

I am not here representing anyone but myself, and I haven't been paid by anyone to come here. I will say that I have been interested

in this foreign-aid problem for several years, and I have yet to talk to a citizen who is for it.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I didn't understand what you said.

Mr. POTTER. I said for several years I have been interested in this question of foreign aid and whenever the matter has come up I haven't found a citizen who says he is for it.

My approach to this, gentlemen, is more from a legal and constitutional aspect of it. I have made it very brief. I could have probably brought you a long brief and made you a lot of comments, but I didn't have time, and I think this will be enough.

Foreign aid voluntarily given by Americans from their personal funds has long existed and is to be highly commended. It is charity, the result, and only the result, of promptings of the human heart. The American is at liberty to give or withhold his own personal largess. Recently, however, foreign aid has come to mean the policy of the Federal Government in the granting of technical, military, and economic aid to foreign peoples and governments, but the aid the Federal Government gives is from funds in the form of taxes it compels its citizens to pay; it is a gift to the foreign governments and peoples, but it is not charity. Congress has no power to levy taxes to make gifts to other peoples of the world, for it has no power to levy taxes for any purpose except as named in the Constitution, which empowers the Congress to—

levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Foreign-aid funds granted by Congress without constitutional authority have been used by foreign nations to reduce their debts and taxes while the debts and taxes of the United States remain stationary, or practically so. Assuming that the Congress has the power to levy taxes to acquire and build military, naval, and air-bases throughout the world because it believes to do so contributes to the common defense of the United States, it is absurd to say the use of taxpayers' money to build in foreign countries roads, hydro-electric dams, et cetera, contributes to the common defense of the United States; therefore, there is no constitutional authority for granting tax money for the latter. Assuming, but not admitting, that Congress has the constitutional power to levy taxes under the general-welfare clause and distribute those funds to some needy Americans so as to raise their standard of living, the Congress certainly has no constitutional power to promote the general welfare of foreign peoples by raising their standard of living by enforced contributions, in the form of taxes, exacted from the American people.

If the Congress believes it good policy to engage in the foreign aid just mentioned, a conscience, sensitive to the oath to support and defend the Constitution, would call for adoption of a resolution to amend the Constitution authorizing the levy of taxes for such purposes. The fact that no such resolution has been offered in the Congress, at least as far as I have heard, would indicate that Congress feels such a proposed amendment would be rejected by the people.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Potter. You take the position that the Congress does not have the power to spend money for foreign aid?

Mr. POTTER. Economic aid; yes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. But they would have power to spend it for military aid?

Mr. POTTER. I think, if the Congress believes that it is for the common defense of the United States, as the Constitution says, it would have the right to levy taxes for the common defense of the United States. If Congress believes that all of these bases strung around the world are necessary for the common defense of the United States, it cannot be declared unconstitutional. But I do believe that this giving moneys outside the United States is clearly unauthorized in the Constitution.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Then you feel that the granting of economic aid has no connection with national defense or the common good of our people?

Mr. POTTER. None at all.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Would you care to express an opinion as to whether or not, setting aside the constitutional question, it would be good or bad?

Mr. POTTER. I don't believe you help people by giving them money. I think we know that with our friends and neighbors. You don't raise their standard of living; you don't help them permanently; you only kill their own self-respect and self-reliance. No; I don't believe it is a good thing. I don't believe it is a good thing for the people that get it.

By the way, gentlemen, I have something here which I want you to have. You may have seen it, but, if you haven't, I'd like for you to see it. I wish I had a copy for each of us. This is a report on American foreign aid, published in a French magazine. It was reprinted in the New Bedford Standard Times and reprinted in the Chicago Tribune, June 15, 1956. The head line is "Why Does the World Hate America". It goes to the silliness of all this foreign aid, that they don't respect you for it, they hate you for it, and instead of building up good will toward America, it is rejecting the good will.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Potter, I think you have made your position perfectly clear. There is a technical question I would like to ask, however. If one believes, and we will take the Marshall plan for illustration, that economic aid under such a plan which produces the stability of Europe is in the common interest of the United States or it is in the interest of the common defense of the United States to have a stabilized Europe, then it would be constitutional; would it not?

Mr. POTTER. The constitution doesn't say that you can levy taxes to stabilize the foreign countries.

Mr. MERROW. If you believe that a stabilized Europe, and just take one section, Western Europe, without poverty, starvation, and so forth, is in the defense of the United States, then it would be constitutional; wouldn't it?

Mr. POTTER. I think that is stretching a long ways the intention of the founding fathers when they adopted the Constitution and the intent and understanding of its meaning when the States ratified that Constitution. The people ratified that Constitution, and they put in there what you could levy taxes for, and they said the common defense. There is no doubt in my mind what they had in mind was

the common defense of the various States; that's what they had in mind.

I am inclined to think, as I stated in the statement, that if military bases abroad are necessary for the defense of the United States, that the courts would hold, the Supreme Court of the United States would hold, that that is a valid taxing power of the Congress, because the Congress has decided it is necessary for the common defense. But it is stretching it a long ways to say that you can help other nations reduce their taxes and reduce their debt and build up their standard of living, to say that is incorporated in the Constitution under the heading of common defense.

I do say this, let the American people decide it by putting it to a vote, having a constitutional amendment presented and giving them a chance to vote on it.

It is certainly not clear, but I think it is far beyond the intention of the statesmen who ratified the Constitution that the Congressmen could vote money for all of these purposes that have been mentioned in foreign countries and for foreign peoples.

Mr. MERROW. I see your point. But, as I said before, if one considers the granting of that money which would produce, or they feel it would produce, stability in different sections of the world and therefore prevent future trouble, and because of that, that it is in the defense of the United States, it would be constitutional; wouldn't it?

Mr. POTTER. If that can be stretched that far, there is no limit, then, by which the Congress, by using words, can tax and spend for anything they want to spend. Why, the Constitution restricts the power of Congress to specific things, and if you are going to read between the lines and put in words that the founders and makers of the Constitution didn't put in and were not in when the States ratified it, where do you end up? You could just do anything then just because the Congress believes it is a good thing for the country, you could go ahead then and appropriate the money and levy the taxes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Then are we to understand that you are willing to risk the judgment of the Congress in perhaps stretching the Constitution a little in connection with bases abroad but you are not willing to risk the judgment of the Congress as to economic and technical aid?

Mr. POTTER. That is right, because it is not in the Constitution. It is stretching the terms and words of the Constitution too far.

Mr. MERROW. Just one more question, and perhaps this is a technicality. Do you think that the interpretation or the assumption that you have made in reference to the defense of the United States is stretching the Constitution farther than it was stretched under the interstate commerce clause?

Mr. POTTER. I don't have in mind what you mean by the interstate commerce clause. I know what the interstate commerce clause is.

Mr. MERROW. The Constitution has grown by interpretations over the years.

Mr. POTTER. I would say that this foreign-aid matter is just another step, another phase of reading into the Constitution what is not there to accomplish the will of those who are heading our Government today.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Potter, I, for one, am fast beginning to believe that there is great merit to the position of many that economic aid has

been too limited, because I can think of so many ways in which we can by economic aid help underdeveloped people to help themselves. Yet I must say that I have often voted to cut economic aid, for the reasons you give against it—a position which is not without merit in the minds of many in Congress, especially the lawyers.

Mr. POTTER. I am not surprised at that.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Potter, if I may ask you good naturedly—I understood you to say that you had never met up with anyone yet who was in favor of foreign aid but you came in today——

Mr. POTTER. I heard it today.

Mr. LECOMPTE. You found a few today?

Mr. POTTER. That is right.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I don't know that I want to ask you any questions. The argument, the discussion, between you and Congressman Merrow is over a point of law that would have to be passed upon by the Supreme Court finally, wouldn't it, whether the Congress can appropriate money for the welfare of other countries?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; they'd have to pass on this.

Mr. LECOMPTE. You would have one opinion and maybe somebody else would have an opinion contrary?

Mr. POTTER. I don't like the way the Supreme Court has been going on a lot of cases, too.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is what we have to go by.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I might say I agree with you, sir.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Potter, maybe others have questions.

Mr. HAYS.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Potter, I hope I don't appear argumentative, but I do want to pursue this matter, because, naturally, you see, when you raise the question of good conscience and our oath of office, that creates certain reflections as to our attitude——

Mr. POTTER. I never meant individually.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Oh, no; I am sure of that. But you are entitled to know that we do take that oath seriously.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure you do.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And that we are eager to defend congressional policy on the basis of strict constitutional authority, and if I thought foreign aid were not within the limits of the Constitution, no matter how desirable I might regard it, why, then, I would have an entirely different position, and, as I say, I don't want to be argumentative, but I do want the record to show that it is a matter that goes not unnoticed by us.

Mr. POTTER. I do not believe that you would purposely—I know you wouldn't purposely—violate your oath of office, but I do believe in my mind, and I am convinced, from the reading of that constitutional provision, about your power to levy taxes, the purposes for which you can levy taxes. If you can levy taxes to pay the debts of foreign governments and build dams and build roads all over the world, what is it you can't levy taxes for? Then what happens to the restriction that the Constitution places on the purposes for which you can levy taxes, that is what I am getting at. There is no limitation on it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. You have certainly presented a thoughtful statement, and, as I say, I didn't want to appear argumentative, but it seems to me that those are considerations that are addressed to the discretion of the Congress, of course, limited by the decrees of the Supreme Court. We have had to resolve those things on the basis of what we believe is within constitutional power.

Mr. Truman had some things to say this morning about world peace. The Congress was motivated in adopting the Marshall plan by the determination not to let the resources of Europe fall into the hands of the Communists. If the Communists had overrun Europe, the amount of steel, the amount of coal, within the Russian orbit, would have been doubled. While we set an estimate of \$17 billion of American expenditure, believing that that was justified as a defense measure, \$4 billion less was spent to reach the goal.

I appreciate what you said about spending for economic stability to strengthen military defense, because it would do no good to put a gun in the hand of a soldier if lacking bread or food, his body was too weak to handle the weapon properly. Several divisions of the South Koreans are now in the field that would not be under arms without our aid. You will pardon me for saying these things.

Mr. POTTER. I am glad to hear them.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. You stimulated my thinking, and I just feel that the record must have this insertion. The Koreans are in no position to do much, except for the supplies of an economic nature which the United States sends to Korea, but it is definitely a military operation.

Mr. POTTER. And I think that would fall under the head of common defense, and you are authorized to levy taxes for the common defense. And I think the aid to the Korean divisions, military aid to the Korean divisions, was clearly justified under the common-defense clause of the Constitution.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. When you assent to that, Mr. Potter, you cover 80 percent of our economic expenditures, 80 percent of our economic aid is related to the 6 principal countries which are on the perimeter of our defense, meaning Formosa, Korea, Japan, Indochina, Pakistan, the area that we regard as crucial because it is at the focal point.

We look to other countries for such critical materials as bauxite, rubber, uranium, tin, any number of things that we do not have in abundance and we feel any program which strengthens the free nations that possess these critical materials is in our defense interest. It is closely enough related to the national defense to meet the constitutionality question.

Mr. POTTER. I do not feel competent to pass upon the wisdom of what you are talking about, whether the Congress should do it or not. I say, if the Constitution doesn't give you the power to do it, you can't do it without going to the people to get the power.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate your statement. As I say, you made a stimulating statement. I did want you to know that our oath is something that hasn't escaped our attention and I did want you to know that we have weighed these questions and problems very carefully.

Mr. POTTER. What you may be proposing may be the best policy for the country, but if you don't have the constitutional power, you will just have to go to the people to get that power.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Don't you think the Supreme Court is the agency to decide?

Mr. POTTER. I would like to see the Supreme Court pass on that question.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The President, who depends on the electorate, could veto and does veto any measure which he considers unconstitutional.

Mr. POTTER. Of course, he could be wrong, too.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Saund.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Potter, suppose we don't want to think that way, suppose we were to go to war with Russia tomorrow, would we depend upon the Philippine Islands to be an ally, just in general thinking?

Mr. POTTER. That is a question I do not feel competent to answer.

Mr. SAUND. Would there be a difference between the Philippine Islands and Red China in a war against us?

Mr. POTTER. I wouldn't be able to say whether you can depend upon the Philippines or not. I do think the Philippines are a very loyal people to the United States today; that is my opinion.

Mr. SAUND. If I thought that giving aid to, say, Pakistan or any country you can think about, economic aid, to help build them economically so that they will not fall under the spell of the propaganda of international communism, and we could depend upon them in case of war, that would be a matter of national defense, would you be willing to spend a little money to do that?

Mr. POTTER. The error in your premise is that poverty breeds communism. As a matter of fact, the Communists in this country are not in the low, needy classes. I think your premise is all wrong. I do not think that by feeding the country of Arabia or any other country is going to keep them out of the clutches of the Kremlin. I think it is fear of American armed might that will keep them out. That is why I am for whatever the Congress and the Military Establishment thinks is necessary to protect the world from further spread of communism and it is the reason why I can believe that the common-defense provision of the Constitution authorizes the spending of money for that purpose.

Mr. SAUND. All right, the President of the United States thinks it is in the interest of national defense that we make friends there in the Middle East, and he says the way to make friends in the Middle East is to give them economic aid. Is he violating the Constitution, according to your way of thinking?

Mr. POTTER. Even if it were wise, and I don't think it is wise, you don't have the power, that is my position, you don't have the power to give them wheat and corn and money to buy clothes to wear. The American people have been very, very generous. You will remember when the earthquake occurred in Tokyo, millions and millions went to the people; it wasn't Government funds.

Am I right about that, gentlemen?

Millions and millions of dollars went to the aid of the Japanese when Tokyo was practically destroyed by earthquakes. I am for all that sort of aid because it comes from Americans and from the good will of the people. When you tax the American people and give it abroad, you don't do any good for the people who receive it or for those who are taxed.

Mr. SAUND. If there are old people in the local community, let their relatives take care of them, is what they believe over there. But we have found out that if the government and states and communities band together they do a much better job. If the American people's hearts do go out where there is poverty, I think there is nothing wrong with the American Government to carry on the wishes and the longing of those American people to go as a government and do that, just like we as a government take care of the aged people all over the United States.

Mr. POTTER. I don't want the Government to tax me to give it away, charity to somebody else. You are exacting by taxation money to make a gift to somebody. If I want to give my hungry neighbor some money, I have a right to do it. And the American people are quite known to be of that disposition.

Mr. SAUND. That is all.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Are there further questions or comments?

Thank you very much.

Mr. SAUND. Thank you, Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Thank you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mrs. Guy E. Price.

Mrs. PRICE. I didn't ask to speak.

Mr. CARNAHAN. If you just wish to submit a statement, you may, but if you have some comment you wish to make, we will be glad to hear you.

Mrs. PRICE. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GUY V. PRICE, KANSAS CITY, MO.

I feel I can't make a statement for any particular group, and, as others have said, I haven't had time to get a signed statement.

I am chairman of the Christian World Relations of our United Church Women here in Kansas City and past president of the Kansas City League of Women Voters, and I am also interested in the social creed program of the Methodist Church. So I will speak just from my concentrated feelings from these past experiences.

I think one thing that has not been mentioned too definitely here today is our share in the budget of the United Nations technical assistance. If I am right, I believe that in 1956 the United States carried 50 percent of that budget, of the U. N. technical assistance, and there is feeling now in Congress, as I understand it, to reduce it to not more than one-third. I have read that this will curtail the program considerably, programs probably that have already been started. I believe I can speak for the United Church Women and other groups that I have mentioned in saying that, if possible, we would like to know that our United States contribution will not be cut.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Are there questions?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I might say from the knowledge that I acquired with Mr. Merrow when we were delegates to the U. N. it depends upon how you calculate the contribution that we make. And I should insert the observation that I agree with you that it should not be cut. I think it is in the long-run interest of this country to invite wide participation, and as we acquaint other nations with their

responsibilities, although they have more limited resources, they will come in for their equitable share.

Mrs. PRICE Yes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If you take into account the amount that a recipient country is to receive for these purposes, you are correct in saying that out of the \$31 million for the expanded technical-assistance program we put up \$15½ million, which is 50 percent, but that is the overall budget for the U. N.'s Expanded Technical Assistance program, and that does not take into account; for example, what a recipient country spends for fighting malaria or for improving their agricultural methods. So some of us feel that those figures also ought to be taken into account in determining this because we, of course, are a giving nation and not a recipient nation, as far as specific expenditures are concerned. I don't want to keep the floor, but to round out the record on that point, many of us feel in the long run we are a recipient nation and that as you combat diseases in areas where it is a real problem you add to the world's health in bottling up a contagion.

Private philanthropy long ago recognized that Mr. Rockefeller once said when asked why he was giving to other countries that other countries had helped him build his fortune, so why shouldn't he return some of it to them, but he added: If I were interested only in America, in fighting for better health in combating diseases in America, I have to fight it where it originates.

The United States spent \$40 million 1 year in fighting the foot-and-mouth disease of Mexico because the cattle raisers in Texas said we'd have to fight it in Mexico to keep it out of Texas. When we spent this we were spending less than a million dollars on human beings, although some of the people who came across the Rio Grande may have brought disease germs. It is pennywise and pound foolish to refuse to spend any money abroad.

Mrs. PRICE. Isn't it true that a dollar spent in the know-how that technical assistance takes goes much farther than just straight out foreign aid?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is right. We forget that many of the miracle drugs are discovered in foreign countries and we have profited by them.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Are there further questions?

Thank you very much.

Since there is some concern as to the consensus on contributions, I might read just a short paragraph from the Appropriation Act of the 84th Congress, approved July 31, 1956.

United Nations expanded program of technical assistance. For contributions authorized by section 306(a), which shall constitute the total United States contribution through December 31, 1957, \$15,500,000: *Provided*, That the United States contribution to the 1958 calendar year program shall not exceed 33.33 percentum of the United Nations program.

Mr. Berkley.

If you do not have your personal background in your statement, for the record would you give us just a brief statement.

**STATEMENT OF ELIOT S. BERKLEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COUNCIL, KANSAS CITY, MO.**

Mr. BERKLEY. Yes. I am Eliot S. Berkley. I am executive director of the International Relations Council. I am also on the faculty of the Kansas City Art Institute and a lecturer in history at the University of Kansas City.

On behalf of the International Relations Council, I want first of all to express a word of welcome to you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee. The work that is being done here in obtaining the views on American foreign policy of citizens of this Midwestern region is a signal service to the cause of furthering interest in foreign policy and creating an informed public opinion. The work of the International Relations Council is devoted to raising the level of public knowledge of international affairs and foreign policy. We hope we have contributed in some degree to broadening the understanding of international affairs in the Kansas City area.

In the balance of this statement I am speaking only for myself as an individual citizen.

American foreign policy must, of course, be shaped by the principles and basic ideas that guide this country. Built upon this solid foundation, our foreign policy must meet the challenges of an uncertain and changing world situation. We must face each condition as it develops, meanwhile being not inactive ourselves in helping to create a world climate favorable to the legitimate national interest of the United States.

We have established within the framework of our Government the agencies and departments that are charged with the responsibility of conducting America's foreign relations. As America's responsibilities in the world have grown, so have the number of agencies of government that work in areas concerned with our foreign relations. Today it is not alone the President and the State Department that conduct our foreign relations, but rather the State Department and elements of many other Government agencies, all working under the leadership of the President.

The role of the public in America's foreign relations is a significant one. The public in one sense makes foreign policy. It sets the outer limits of what that policy can be. It restricts the area in which the Executive can operate. But this is not a one-way street. It is actually the interplay of the agencies of government and the public that creates the atmosphere in which American foreign relations are conducted.

The sources of information available to the Government that are not available to the general public do much to determine the foreign policies of the United States. The public must think and act within the somewhat more severe limitation of what is general knowledge. Therefore, sometimes, attitudes toward foreign policy issues are based on quite incomplete information. As we have come into more perilous times, this has become more and more true. Yet the Government is to a significant degree dependent upon a public as fully informed as possible to support its policies, and, indeed, to a limited extent, to help create them.

This poses a problem that is only partly answerable at present. The public must endeavor to keep itself as well informed as possible on the issues of the day. They must gather much of the pertinent

information and recognize that what they believe and say about these issues is of importance.

It is a task of government, then, to be responsive to what is said. It cannot, of course, promise to direct foreign policy on the basis of a public opinion poll, but it can make known that the views of the public are one of the factors that go into determining what each facet of foreign policy is. The idea that one plays a part is significant; not that one has his views adopted each time as the determinant of policy.

The informing of the public and the public informing of government are perhaps the parts of our method of determining foreign policy that could use the greatest strengthening. All areas of the United States must be given consideration. Yet too often it is only the secondhand report of events in New York or Washington that make but a vague and passing impression on the great stretch of territory between the east and west coasts. It is in the midlands that there must be effort to present the story of American foreign policy. One can then expect new interest and vigor.

One of the chief foreign policy questions of the day is the foreign aid program. For several years now we have been engaged in a program of economic assistance to other countries. This has been based upon their great need as well as upon the belief that it is in the best interest of the United States that these countries receive our help. These two concepts, as so often with elements of American foreign policy, have moved along parallel with one another in most cases. We have found occasionally, however, that the interests of the United States were not directly served by the extension of aid to certain countries, that the cost was greater than any possible increment to the protection of the national interest of the United States.

Today we find ourselves confronted with many questions:

(1) What has been the experience of the past several years growing out of American aid programs? Where have they been successful, and where have they failed and in what degree?

(2) What would be the consequences in particular instances of not continuing or of expanding a given aid program?

(3) What is the value of foreign aid in relation to the questions of reduction of taxes, balancing the budget, spending funds for other programs?

(4) Can we afford to continue aid on the same scale today as in the past, or, conversely, can we afford to curtail it?

(5) Should we begin to apply more stringent rules to those who receive American aid?

(6) What share of a Government foreign aid program can now be taken over by private investment with perhaps more satisfactory long-term gains and less cost to the taxpayer?

These questions must be examined, along with many others, before any logical and reasoned answer to questions about the foreign aid program can be given. We must have our national policy objectives clear first; then we can evaluate the worth of any program in which we are engaged, discuss alternatives and establish priorities. The Government cannot do everything: it must make choices. If a program is valuable and there is not the money to accomplish it by methods being used, then perhaps new methods can be discovered. The public can set the criteria for making decisions, but those decisions must be made by the legislative and executive branches of government on the

basis of information available to them. Careful study is required to determine which phases of activity that carry out our foreign policy should be expanded, contracted, or eliminated.

Foreign policy should not and must not be the result of a mere popular referendum. The weight of public opinion is one very important element in determining foreign policy, but the careful determination of what is in the national interest is primary. An informed public will far more often support foreign policy in the national interest than one that is not. An informed public is the backstop for foreign policy, and the more we recognize this role, the more effective will be the foreign policy of the United States. The public must act as a storehouse of information and understanding that will be there to support the actions of its Government when those actions are generally in line with its ideas. In criticizing or supporting such policies, the public at the same time is giving new direction to foreign policy.

Therefore, in determining the answers to the many questions concerning foreign aid, we, as the public, might set these criteria for decision:

1. What is the national policy objective being served by our foreign aid programs?
2. How well is it fulfilling this purpose?
3. Has study revealed alternative programs that will accomplish it more effectively?
4. In the light of strategic considerations is this program important?

Certainly today there are areas of the world where the standard of living is higher than it would have been without our foreign aid program. In like manner, there are nations in the western camp or still outside the Communist orbit in part because of this assistance. There are other countries where the issues are still to be decided. If thorough study shows that these methods do work, that it is important that these tasks be accomplished, that there are not better alternatives, that we can afford them in relation to our total economic situation, then foreign aid programs must be continued. Each part of the program must be examined on its merits and a realistic appraisal made of what is to be retained and what discarded. The public, if kept informed as these steps are being taken, will have confidence and give support.

I think I should say one thing further in regard to foreign aid. It must be viewed as a part of the totality of American foreign policy. That policy is built upon the strengthening of the coalition of democratic powers to preserve the liberties that are the basis of our society. To accomplish this end we have felt it necessary to bring into being substantial military strength through our own Armed Forces and through the creation of an alliance of the free nations. The combination of economic assistance to our friends within this alliance and military cooperation has so far given us the strength to continue to expand our economy, raise our standard of living, and, through the fact of our power in being, stave off any hostile action by totalitarian communism.

We must continually hold up these elements of our foreign policy for review. We must not accept the status quo as the determinant of our policy. But before we make any major departure from a policy that has in the main been successful in its objectives, we must

be sure that the element which we seek to withdraw has accomplished its purpose or that we have something better to take its place. We cannot afford to pull out one of the pillars before we are certain that it is no longer needed to keep the structure standing.

By this I do not mean that it cannot be reshaped to fit changing conditions. Indeed, it must be. But it must be done with care and wisdom, not hastily or in response to factors outside the scope of the problem. And we should remember too that a change in policy of substantial proportions can have effects beyond the change itself. Just as we must not give false hope of great new projects that do not materialize, so too must we avoid untimely outcries of condemnation because we make a shift in emphasis in our total program of defending the free world. When changes occur, they must be prepared for; they must be gradual and take into account the attitudes we are trying to create. For it is not alone the powerplant that we help to build or the families that we help to feed that are the end result of economic assistance. We hope it goes beyond that into an understanding of the United States and what it stands for and its objective of maintaining the independence of the democratic nations.

While this testimony has not directly answered a question on whether foreign aid should be continued or to what extent, if it can help to show the proper role of the public in American foreign policy and establish a basis for evaluating that role, it will have served its purpose.

Thank you very much for your interest and attention.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Berkley.

Are there questions or comments?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I just want to say that you have made a very thought-provoking statement and one which I think should and will be helpful to every Member of Congress who must make a decision on this matter.

Mr. BERKLEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Cockrell.

**STATEMENT OF EWING COCKRELL, PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES
FEDERATION OF JUSTICE, AND SPECIAL COMMISSIONER,
MISSOURI SUPREME COURT, WARRENSBURG, MO.**

Mr. COCKRELL. In behalf of support for the great declarations of President Eisenhower and President Truman and other world leaders the following records are submitted.¹ They reveal the great value of these declarations and the need for their public support. They fall in three sets.

1. The first are four pages of declarations for complete disarmament or police force (or both) to maintain world peace. They are part of a printed assembly which is apparently the greatest in world history from leaders of such powerful nations. Those of Presidents Truman and Eisenhower are specially strong and practical. Many others will be submitted, if desired.

2. The second are photostats of records during President Eisenhower's term of proposals or statements by his officials or himself

¹ Supporting papers are in the files of the Subcommittee

which oppose, block, or delay all these declarations. They include these, among others:

(a) Photostats of all the United Nations resolutions on armaments during his term adopted by the Assembly and approved by his officials. They are of April 8, 1953, which also "reaffirms" that of January 11, 1952; November 18, 1953, November 4, 1954, and December 16, 1955.

(b) Proposal by the President April 16, 1953, for arms reduction but with no force to enforce it or anything else. It would allow atomic, biological, and all other kinds of war by any nation any time (photostat).

(c) Statement by the President's representative in the United Nations May 21, 1954, that if there arises any serious violation of any agreement on armaments, "nobody could realistically be given sufficient authority to punish them" (photostat C).

(d) Proposal by the same representative that if there is such a violation, there must be a treaty to permit states to protect themselves by self-defense (photostat D).

(e) Publication No. 5554, August 1954, advocating building the United Nations as an organization to keep the peace without any power to compel obedience to its recommendations. Issued by the State Department.

(f) Proposal by the President's representative and those of Great Britain, France, and Canada March 8, 1955, for arms reduction but with no force to enforce it. Would allow all kinds of war by all nations (photostat).

(g) Proposal by Secretary Dulles with Foreign Ministers of Britain and France for arms reduction but with no force to enforce it (photostat).

(h) Proposal April 17, 1957, by the President's representative (Stassen) in the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament at London for some reduction of armaments with an inspection board of the representatives of 14 states. Serious problems of enforcement to be reported to the Security Council and any government may discontinue disarmament. No force provided for the board or the Security Council or other body. Would allow war at will—as all other proposals (New York Times, April 18, 1957).

(i) Statement by the President in weekly press conference April 17, 1957, that his representatives in the subcommittee at London (Stassen) had reported to him some progress toward partial disarmament (New York Times, Apr 18, 1957).

3. In addition to the above positive records, the following go along with and corroborate them:

(j) Apparently no resolution or proposal in the United Nations which even mentions or endorses the President's declarations for complete disarmament and police power.

(k) Apparently no speech made and publicized in Congress favoring such declarations.

(l) Apparently no resolution introduced in Congress favoring such declarations.

3. The other set of records are some that make today the brightest period in world history for permanent peace. They are proposals by British and Russian leaders which do carry out these declarations for complete disarmament and international police force. The earliest are these Soviet ones:

(m) Proposal by representative Yakov Malik May 17, 1954, in the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee for complete disarmament one-third each year (photostat). Apparently never approved by the President or his officials or even reported to the public by them. Yet they appear to be the first such ever made in the United Nations. All the great declarations of our Presidents and other leaders were made outside of that body.

(n) Same disarmament proposal made September 30, 1954, in the United Nations by representative Vishinsky but three times as fast, one-half each 6 months or 1 year. No proposal by the President or his officials to adopt and add inspection provisions approved by them or other safeguards (photostat).

(o) These are Soviet proposals for inspections that apparently have never been reported to the public by the President or his officials. Nor any attempt made to adapt or adopt them in any way approved by the President. They were made in May and June in the Disarmament Subcommittee in London 1954, and are obviously only key extracts:

ON COMPLETENESS OF DISARMAMENT

We are insisting on disclosure and verification of all information from revolvers and revolver ammunition to the hydrogen bomb inclusive. Such is our proposal (verbatim record June 4, 1954, SC/DC.1 PV 14, p. 18)

ON COMPLETENESS OF ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL AND INSPECTIONS

We propose the establishment of control at once in all deposits and undertakings—from the Belgian Congo to the atomic undertakings of the United States of America, from the deposit of uranium ores to the Soviet undertakings, inclusive (verbatim record, May 19, 1954 SC/DC.1 PV 4, p. 69)

We demand admittance for officers of an international control organ and are ready to admit them to our plants producing atomic energy (verbatim record, May 28, 1954, SC/SC1 PV 11, p. 11)

NO VETO

It is not our conception that there should be a veto in the control organ (verbatim record, June 15, 1954, SC/DC 1/PV 18, p. 100)

(Photostats of all above inspection records)

The foundation of these Soviet records appear to be nearly 30 years old. They are in the Soviet Draft Disarmament Convention of 1928–32 for—

immediate, complete and general disarmament (14 pp.).

The inspection provision (article 55) is for the international control commission to have—

every facility for the full investigation of all branches of the activities of the state, of public associations and of private persons in case of any doubt with regard to disarmament

None of these early proposals by the Soviets appears to have been approved or mentioned by the President or his officials or any effort made to encourage Russia to stand by them.

(p) December 4, 1944, Marshal Stalin declared for protection against aggressors and “a world organization having at its command everything necessary to uphold peace and avert new aggression” and having “armed forces” (Soviet Information Bulletin, Nov. 14, 1944, p. 4).

No approval or mention of this advocacy has apparently come at any time from the President or his officials.

(q) British declarations:

FOR POLICE FORCE

British representative Selwyn Lloyd, now Foreign Secretary, on May 21, 1954, in the United Nations subcommittee at London advocated, in two pages, "a police force" to "supervise and enforce" agreements on arms reduction and prohibition of atomic weapons, as "the only way to make progress."

FOR FORCE AND DISARMAMENT

Prime Minister Macmillan, in the House of Commons, March 2, 1955, is reported as saying:

Atomic disarmament must include all weapons, new and old, conventional and unconventional. The control must provide effective international or, if we like, supranational authority invested with real power. Honorable Members may say that is elevating the United Nations, or whatever may be the authority, into something like world government. Be it so, it is none the worse for that. In the long run this is the only way for mankind.

Since then, Secretary Lloyd has advocated "a permanent United Nations force to help maintain peace" (New York Times, November 12, 1956) and Prime Minister Macmillan "comprehensive disarmament" of "new weapons and conventional forces" (New York Times, April 6, 1957).

A new epoch has now come in the United Nations from the foregoing British and Soviet declarations for force and complete disarmament. They appear the first ever made in the United Nations.

Both are backed by the Macmillan declaration for such disarmament and force—apparently the first such a one published in the past 4 years from any Prime Minister, Premier, or President.

The Soviet proposals for inspections made in 1954 in the United Nations are the first such to appear in that body. They back theirs of 1928-32. They are stronger than any to come from any other government, as published in the general press.

Today the governments need not explore or even seek new roads to peace. These declarations and proposals of this new epoch open wide a road built on the fundamentals of peace enforcement and of proved success for centuries, if and when used. And whenever the governments are ready to travel it, they can be supplied with detailed measures of proved success for all their steps along the road.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you. One or two other witnesses have come in, but we do appreciate your speaking to us out of your years of experience.

Mrs. Demaree.

We will give you 10 minutes, so you proceed, and I am sure you will be able to give us your ideas in that length of time.

Mrs. DEMAREE. I don't need 10 minutes because I brought my 10 copies. I would object to 10 copies except that I am in the supply and office stationery business.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Do you want to present your statement or would you like to have it printed in the record?

STATEMENT OF MRS. OPHELIA M. DEMAREE, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mrs. DEMAREE. I would like to summarize the headings. You see, I have just come in, so I don't know what you have been having during the day.

When I heard from you and from Washington I didn't know what special aspect of the foreign policy you were going to concentrate on.

My activities in the field of international relations date from 1932, and to give you some background:

I was a delegate for many years to the National Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, Washington, D. C.

I was State foreign policy chairman, Missouri League of Women Voters, for 6 years.

I was the founder of the Kansas City chapter of the William Allen White Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.

I was a delegate to the citizens conferences held by the Department of State in Washington, D. C., and at the United Nations, on the Marshall plan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the point 4 program.

I was delegate to the national UNESCO Conference at Hunter College, New York City.

I was president of the Council on World Affairs of Greater Kansas City for 3 years.

I was program chairman of the English Speaking Union, Kansas City branch, since its beginning in November 1955 up to the present time.

I want to say that I am expressing my own personal opinions.

Trade is better than aid, both economically and moralewise. Trade is a two-way street; a nation must buy to sell. Today the United States is the world's most powerful nation. As the world's leading creditor, we cannot keep our money and goods, too. We must sell abroad to maintain high production and employment in our own country. We must buy if we expect to be paid for what we sell. About one-half of the world operates on sterling and needs dollars to trade with us. The only way they can get dollars is to sell to us. They can't sell to us if we raise tariff barriers to stop their goods from coming in. Artificial protection for domestic production is uneconomical, unsound, and is an anachronism in today's world. Because a minority group is vocal and puts on political pressures is no proper basis for national policy or international relations. All citizens should support the reciprocal trade agreements program and insist in its vigorous application to a general lowering of artificial trade barriers. The United States should join the International Trade Organization, as evidence of our good faith and of our good will.

The United Nations is no supernatural organization but is only as good as its members make it. Instead of acting unilaterally, we should make maximum use of it and try always to strengthen and perfect it. Already the U. N. is beginning to have a world police force—e. g., Korea and Suez. Political problems make the headlines, but there is need to emphasize the continuing fine humanitarian work done year after year by the World Health Organization, technical assistance, UNICEF, and so forth. By contributing our skills and money to the solution of basic economic and social problems, we are getting at the source of problems that erupt into strife and war. Ours is a

shrinking world, due to progress in communication, transportation, and other scientific developments. Because ours is an atomic age, all nations and peoples are fatefully interdependent. We therefore need the strongest possible United Nations Organization to preserve justice, order, and peace.

Plebiscites under proper international supervision should be encouraged to settle local disputes such as the Saar, Kashmir, and so forth.

In 1933 I was a guest at the White House with a group of women attending the National Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, of which Mrs. Roosevelt was also a member. I shall never forget something President Roosevelt said to us:

Yours is a worthy endeavor, but education for peace must be universal. Whether our country can live in peace depends on what other countries do.

This is one of the reasons why we cannot allow our foreign policy to become static; but why, as Secretary Dulles stated recently, it must be flexible.

Disarmament: However much we hate war, we must remain strong militarily. Disarmament must be obligatory on all and universally supervised and controlled. It must not be unilateral. Let us not forget the lesson of the Washington Naval Disarmament Pact with its 5-5-3 agreement by the United States, Great Britain, and Japan. Only a few years later, the Japanese attacked and surprised us at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. She makes sense.

Mrs. DEMAREE. Thank you, sir, I heard that aside. You are Mr. Hays from Arkansas, my neighbor, I see.

Then, as far as politics are concerned, political sagacity is an important political asset for all you gentlemen and voters, too, but politics should be eliminated as far as possible from the conduct of United States foreign policy. Policies should be bipartisan, with decisions arrived at by both major parties. To be in the best national interest, policies should not be unduly influenced by pressure groups, however politically powerful, rich, or numerous they may be—whether these minorities be high tariff protectionists, labor political action groups, Zionists, et cetera.

Internal economy: If we do not maintain a healthy internal economy ourselves, we will not even survive, much less be able to help others. The average employee in the United States sees only his take-home pay. But the employer knows well how much more he is obliged to pay out in Government taxes. (I am both employer and employee.) If Government expenses and taxes are reduced, this would be a major deterrent to inflation. It would also contribute to better employer-employee relations. These budget and tax reductions should be achieved before our economy reaches the breaking point.

Expenditures abroad should be kept at a minimum. Ostentatious display does not make friends and influence people. We should refrain from making other people feel inferior or we only antagonize them. More Americans are traveling abroad every year. From my own travels, and from comments by other travelers, come these questions: Why erect an expensive skyscraper if the old United States legation is adequate and also reflects our appreciation of native architecture, e. g. Tangier? Why expensive apartments, with maid

service, for staff people whose work does not require such elaborate establishments, and who "never had it so good" in the United States, e. g. West Germany? Why build an extravagant night club in Rome? Why erect huge, costly United States Information Centers, which foreigners do not come to, or use? Why support trained personnel in West Berlin, or Bilbao, Spain, with nothing to do? Why maintain fleets of luxury motor cars, apparently used mostly to take clerks back and forth from work? Such waste makes a bad impression on the American citizen abroad, as well as on the nationals of these foreign countries. The Government, whether in its operation or in foreign aid, should be like a good and vigilant housekeeper and make sure value is received for every dollar spent. Example is the best teacher.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you a lot, Mrs. Demaree. I want to say to you I remember with a lot of pleasure a visit to Kansas City 3 or 4 years ago while you were president of the Council of World Affairs. We are delighted to have you and we appreciate your statement.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mrs. Demaree, I want to concur in what my colleague, Mr. Hays, said. You've made an excellent statement. It is realistic and practical. You certainly qualify for my team.

Mrs. DEMAREE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mrs. Milliken.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GLADYS K. MILLIKEN, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mrs. MILLIKEN. I am a college graduate. Most of my education was obtained at the Kansas State College, but I took my degree at Kirksville Teachers College and was a teacher for a few years, first in grade schools, and then in high school, and I am speaking only for myself.

The question of constitutionality had occurred to me, but the question in regard to the 80 percent has been pretty well cleared up by the discussion I have heard. But I don't like the idea of the remaining 20 percent of the funds that are not contributing to the joint military effort. It seems that you are only taking our good will for authority to make grants. To me, considering our heavy national debt and the fact that someone made the remark here today that not one Congressman could be found who ever thought that it would ever be paid, just astonished and shocked me. That is just exactly what Russia wants. I hope it isn't true. I hope it isn't even partly true, because to me it is unthinkable that we fail to pay; and it would certainly give us the worst kind of a depression. The last one wouldn't hold a candle to what this one would be if we ever reneged on our obligations. And I know what that last one was because for a number of months I alone lived on 50 cents a week. My sister said she was setting a table regularly for herself and her husband for 75 cents a week. So we know what we are talking about when we talk about depressions. Then my husband and I lived for a matter of months on \$6.50 a month for food, water, lights, and fuel. We burned kerosene for fuel and lamps. We got by, and I was thankful that we were able to get by with as little help as we had to have, for we finally had to have a little help; so I know what that depression was.

To me, this is a question of morals. What appeals to me most strongly is the immorality of feeling that we can give away anything

if we can't pay our debts. It is strictly immoral to make gifts if you can't pay your debts. You may defer the debts. That would be consonant with morality, to defer the debts in order to make loans. We could have sometimes made loans when we made gifts. For instance, when Mr. Warne went over to help the Iranians when they were in financial straits after tolerating Mossadegh for so long. There is no question but what they needed help and needed it badly; but he went over there with the idea of building dams for electric power. They came to him and they said, "Let us have a loan of \$500,000 to build an electric powerplant powered by our own oil," and he said, "I can't lend to you but I will build you a plant," and he started a dam on their big river, which is in a gorge. He did some other things, too. One of the things he did. He encouraged them to plant beets for beet sugar. They have a good deal of sugarcane in the southern part of Iran, and they do depend largely on sugar, but he encouraged them to plant beets and provided them a factory for the manufacture of beet sugar. They, of course, had to learn how to grow the beets first. That was all right; that wasn't bad. He also provided them equipment for another factory that they had no building for and which could only be stored. Then he started the building of this big dam, and he spent about \$30 million on that. His total outlay in the country was \$300 million, and it included money so that a lot of the legislators could increase their salaries.

Now, I don't know whether that was justifiable, but I have my doubts about it. And the \$30 million that was supposed to be mostly for the dam, not enough to build the whole thing, but to start it, well, it included a million and a half for a work camp with a swimming pool. It was hot enough that they probably needed the swimming pool all right, but it seems to me that was pretty expensive. They had 53 automobiles and 41 paid chauffeurs. They took about 400 Americans over there on good salaries to do the staff work. I think it was a terrible way to spend the money if there is no prospect of our being able to pay our debts, our national debts. That just isn't considered to be possible. We must pay our debt and withhold gifts that aren't strictly necessary.

Those people only wanted to borrow a modest sum. I am glad they had something more, but at the same time I don't think it is justifiable if we don't pay our debts, and that means our big national debt, and we ought to pay more than just the interest on it. That is ruining us, and that is just exactly what Russia wants.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yes.

Mr. SAUND. Do you have any way to substantiate the statements that you have made to put in the record?

Mrs. MILLIKEN. The Reader's Digest is my authority, my main authority, and it had the article in it, which gave the figures which I have mentioned.

Mr. SAUND. Could you give us something which will substantiate the facts which you have stated here?

Mrs. MILLIKEN. I think that is such a strictly reputable magazine—I have forgotten who the author of the article was, but it is such a reputable magazine I don't see how anyone can question it.

Mr. SAUND. No, no; just to put in the record to substantiate it.

Mrs. MILLIKEN. I think that would substantiate it.

(Subsequently, Mrs. Milliken informed the subcommittee as follows:

The Mr. Warne mentioned was Mr. Wm E Warne, of the International Cooperation Administration. Most of my information came from an article, 'How Not to Handle Foreign Aid,' by Bernard S. Van Rensselaer in the Reader's Digest of February 1957.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. You have heard only the side that was given in this article?

Mrs. MILLIKEN. Yes; and I don't think it could ever have been published that way if it hadn't been true. This man Warne managed to hush up the people who were opposed to his methods and his actions, he managed to hush them up or dismiss them, one or the other. Finally he was transferred, the last I knew that article stated that he had been transferred to Korea. Well, in Korea they probably haven't the oil and probably dams and electric power; waterpower, is all right, that may be a good thing there, but he was daffy on dams or he wouldn't have ignored all that source of power they had right there.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you very much. We are glad to have you.
Mrs. WASSERSTROM.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. SOLBERT M. WASSERSTROM, PARTICIPANT
AND REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY WOMEN IN AN INFORMAL REFERENDUM, KANSAS
CITY, MO.**

Mrs. WASSERSTROM. I am submitting a statement for the record. I didn't intend to testify orally, but in the course of the day's activity here I did build up steam to the point that I did want to say something orally to you gentlemen. You have been very gracious, and I won't impose too much.

I would like to say that the statement that I bring for the record is not a composition of my own or anyone individual. It was a statement that involved the opinions of 1,000 representative Kansas Citizens in an informal referendum on foreign policy issues in Kansas City. The State Department had extended an invitation to the University of Kansas City, along with 29 other universities in our country, to conduct such a referendum after the completion of 4 months' study by representative groups of the respective communities. For that reason I felt it was very meaningful to you gentlemen to have this report in your record.

Before I go on I might say that among the 19 groups that were asked to participate in this 4 months' study we had the three major religious faiths represented. We had all of the women's organizations combined in one study group. That was called the interclub women group. And that combined group represented only 1 of the 19 groups. We had businessmen in another group. We had bankers in another group. We had labor leaders in another group. So that these findings are truly representative of Midwest thinking. And the groups included an area outside of Kansas City, too.

This informal referendum on foreign policy issues under the joint sponsorship of the University of Kansas City, the Greater Kansas City Adult Education Association, and the Council on World Affairs was held in Kansas City in the spring of 1955. At the conclusion of this 4-month study representatives of 19 groups drawn from business

and industrial executives, business and professional women, church groups of the 3 major religious faiths, Leagues of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women, Council of Jewish Women, and other women's groups, college groups, professions, area groups from North Kansas City, Mission; Kansas City, Mo., and Johnson County, Kans., and other sources, compiled certain findings in regard to foreign policy all of which are relevant to the current world situation.

The salient points of this report dated July 14, 1955, are as follows:

1. TRADE BARRIERS

All groups were unanimous in agreeing that increased trade with less-developed countries is a prime need if they are to stand on their own feet. The groups stated that this means gradual lowering of tariffs and easing of other trade barriers and promoting reciprocal trade agreements on a stable and comparatively long-term basis. All recognized that this will mean some economic dislocations but that the stakes of world peace and advancement of world living standards greatly outweigh the difficulties. Measures to soften the impact in cases of acute distress were urged.

2. ECONOMIC, TECHNICAL, AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

All groups agreed that economic, technical, and humanitarian assistance wisely given in full cooperation with the countries that request it, is the highest type of insurance of a healthy world community. It is also the best insurance against the spread of communism.

Many groups felt strongly that nonmilitary aid should be recognized as comparably valuable with military aid. They did not expect nonmilitary expenditures to equal the military but felt strongly that dollar for dollar, technical and humanitarian assistance may well outweigh military aid in long-term effect.

Some felt that our investment in technical assistance through the United Nations should be greatly increased.

All agreed on the importance of increased private investment abroad and many felt it would be wise to use such incentives as tax exemptions and limited Government insurance to stimulate such investment.

Without exception, all felt that aid should come from a variety of sources, private, United States Government, U. N., and philanthropic foundations. They felt too, that this flexible, composite approach should be jointly planned with representatives both of the investors and givers and recipients of the aid.

Some felt that relatively modest sums applied to technical assistance would suffice since the receiving countries could then build at their own pace and sustain their own programs.

Most groups felt that large projects such as India's 15-year plan would require large foreign capital and should be aided with long-term, low interest loans through international banking facilities.

The groups considered such evidence as the necessity for great river power and irrigation projects, roads, medical programs dealing with tens of millions of cases of the four mass "killers," yaws, trachoma.

tuberculosis, and malaria, and the countless needs for educational and technical assistance.

Great emphasis was placed on what a Rockhurst College group call the Revolution of Rising Expectations. After centuries of hunger and fatalism "the sun" of the new hopes and demands of the Orient "comes up like thunder." It was recognized by all that the methods and the results of free enterprise and the free world must be shown, soon, in the less developed countries as more effective than Communist methods in China, if the "revolution" is to move toward democracy—not dictatorship.

A particularly interesting point of complete agreement in all groups was that most scrupulous care be taken not to insult or offend the receivers. One group warned against our taking the rich uncle attitude. Each group insisted that the program be handled so that the pride, the initiative, and the local culture of each nation aided be held in high respect.

The first rule stressed is that each step be taken on request of the country aided, and the second rule is that the plan be made and carried out with the maximum of local cooperation and initiative.

It was generally recognized that with the record of colonialism and ideas of white superiority behind the West, any western nation starts with two strikes against it. These disadvantages can be overcome if strict diplomacy is observed. The records of the Ford Foundation in Asia and of Chester Bowles in India were cited by several members to illustrate the good results that come from a modest, friendly, and flexible approach.

All groups agreed in general that industrial development of one type or another is essential in all the underdeveloped countries. However, the ifs and qualifications were interesting. Some members questioned whether American-type industrialization would not actually do more harm than good by injuring the cultural pattern of some countries. Other stressed the need to fit the remedy to the situation. For example, the attempt to mechanize agriculture in ricefields simply meant tractors stuck in the mud.

Disagreements tend to disappear when industrial development was flexibly defined. Industrial development in Egypt will be very different from industrial development in Detroit. Yet everywhere it is clear that without science and technology the battle against disease and hunger cannot be won.

The industrial executives stressed the importance of elbow room for private investment. They believed that controls and regulations should be sufficiently limited to allow for efficient development of industry in underdeveloped countries. However, this group joined the others in stressing the paramount necessity of working cooperatively with United Nations agencies and with the countries assisted.

The Rockhurst group ventured the idea that industrialization may help the cause of democracy. This view sees industry as (1) raising living standards so democracy can stand a chance, (2) teaching teamwork, (3) improving communications. The group cited the case of Catholic missions in Paraguay and the Southwest where nomadic tribes were introduced to stable village life.

The scope of the job already begun is seen in the Indian 15-year plan which calls for a river control, power, and irrigation program three times the size of TVA.

3. COLONIALISM

"Colonialism" by general consensus has become a bad word—or at best, a word that belongs to yesterday and has no place in the modern world. Almost without exception, the groups rejected the whole stock of attitudes and practices that come to mind when you say "colonialism." "Gun boat" diplomacy, exploitation of weaker peoples, "high hatting" the brown, red, yellow, and black peoples.

Even the prettied up version of colonialism—the do-good version—was rejected. The North Kansas City group for example stated: "Our slogan should be to help other nations help themselves—rather than lift them up." The old doctrine of the white man's burden has been almost totally displaced by the modern point 4 idea of sharing ideas, science, and technology.

4. BILATERAL VERSUS MULTILATERAL ACTION

Several of the groups were vigorous in their feeling that so far as possible the multilateral technique of working through the U. N. is better than bilateral dealings of this country with individual nations. They felt strongly that U. N. action is more democratic and helps greatly to avoid the suspicion of many countries of the United States. They felt too that in matters of technical aid, the U. N. can draw on technicians and scientists from all parts of the world.

Others felt, however, that the large investments of this country in foreign aid make it necessary to keep control of these expenditures in our own hands rather than turn them over to the U. N.

These also felt that the U. N. is not yet sufficiently established as an agency to warrant its handling huge sums. However, the contrast between United States bilateral contributions reaching such a figure as half a billion in a year and the exceedingly small sum allocated to the U. N. for technical assistance is so marked, that most of the group members favored a policy of building up the U. N. side of the picture where possible.

The interclub women's group concluded its report with the statement made in 1949 when the then President (Mr. Truman) said of point 4:

Only by helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent, satisfying life that is the right of all people.

Democracy alone can supply the vitalizing force to stir the peoples of the world into triumphant action, not only against their human oppressors, but also against their ancient enemies—hunger, misery, and despair

5. INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Several of the groups studied special problems such as language teaching and international exchange of persons.

A general community group involving 50 persons interested in the language teaching problem and a special group from the teachers of the French Institute of Notre Dame de Sion drew up recommendations stating that "speaking and understanding a foreign language is a valuable aid to peace" and noting that the great increase in our commercial investment abroad and in the number of our young people spending some time abroad—and greatly increased travel by ordinary citizens make a second language a necessity.

The resolution states that a foreign language teaching program should be included in the public-school curriculum—and that the work should be begun in the elementary grades, using a conversational approach.

6. IMMIGRATION

One group met to consider the effect of the McCarran Act on the attitude of other countries toward the United States. It was pointed up sharply that the low quotas for Latin and Slavic countries and the quotas of 100 each for Asiatic countries have done serious injury to their attitude toward the United States. The oriental quotas, particularly, are viewed as a gross insult to half the world's population.

The group did not take formal action. One or two members vigorously defended the idea of "nordic superiority." A considerable majority disagreed, strongly opposed the discrimination against south Europeans and Asians.

7. INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

One group addressed itself to the International Covenant on Human Rights. Deep concern was expressed that the United States policy is now opposed to this country becoming a signatory. No formal conclusion was reached. A fairly strong minority view was that "rights" should be made effective through education and persuasion rather than international law. The majority appeared to feel that the influence of an international covenant is essential and that the signature of the United States is especially important if we hope to convince the rest of the world of our integrity as champions of the great freedoms.

Another group dealt with the large-sized problem and opportunity presented by visitations to this country of numerous foreign students. More careful planning is needed in briefing these students and in giving them a more meaningful experience here through hospitality and improved provision for helping them gain a real understanding of our people and institutions.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mrs. Wasserstrom.

Mr. McCormick.

STATEMENT OF THURMAN L. McCORMICK, ATTORNEY, AND CHAIRMAN, CONGRESS OF FREEDOM, INC., KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman and members, my name is Thurman L. McCormick. By profession I am an attorney at law. My office is located at 910 Rialto Building, Kansas City, Mo. I have been engaged in the practice of law at the Kansas City bar for over 30 years.

I am testifying today on my own behalf as well as on behalf of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., of which organization I am chairman.

Now just a word as to the background of the Congress of Freedom, Inc. The Congress of Freedom, Inc., is a collation of many organizations located in all or most all the States of the United States. Headquarters of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., are located in Omaha, Nebr. The board of directors of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., include many nationally known figures. To name only a few: J. Bracken Lee, former Governor of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah; Dr.

James L. Deenges, Anderson, Ind.; George Thomas (executive director), of Omaha, Nebr.; John H. Wisner, Jr., of Summit, N. J.; Harry T. Everingham, of Chicago; Jessica Payne, Representative of West Virginia; Willie E. Stone, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mary D. Cain, publisher and lecturer, of Mississippi. That is just to name a few.

So much for identification.

Now at the very outset and without preliminaries I desire to make it clear and definite that the Congress of Freedom, Inc., for which I speak today, abhors, decries, and opposes without qualification the dissipation of the money and wealth of the United States under the name of foreign aid or any other name or subterfuge that has or may be devised or established.

There are I believe many excellent reasons for this position. I desire to conserve your time and therefore I will name only a few.

Between July 1, 1945, and July 1, 1955, more than \$55.5 billion has been taken away by the Government from American citizens (under the alleged asserted right so to do) and distributed abroad as gifts and loans to foreign governments. During this 10-year period the foreign aid was \$51,339,142,000.

This was done in the face of the fact that our national debt is at least 280 billions of dollars. This debt exceeds the combined debt of the rest of the world. We are giving away billions of dollars to countries that are practically debt free as compared to ourselves. I submit to this committee that this shows on its face a callous disregard for the solvency of our country and could be better described as the act of a lunatic government than one of "enlightened foreign policy."

Now what do the proponents offer in justification? When we add up all the multitude of phony reasons brought forward in justification, just one is paramount—defense against communism.

All right, how has this defense against communism worked? We have provided large sums to Tito, a Communist dictator and an avowed collaborator with the U. S. S. R., including a swarm of our latest jet airplanes in order to defend against Communist Yugoslavia. No amount of diplomatic double-talk can hide the fact that Tito and his government are part and parcel of the world conspiracy of communism and anything that strengthens that government renders us comparatively weaker.

Now aside from the tremendous cost and loss that we have suffered in the foreign aid "give away," what is even worse, this foreign aid program has actually built up and kept in existence and made possible the development of nationalization and socialism in Great Britain, France, and Italy, just to name a few examples.

Just look at the record, as Al Smith used to say.

Even at the very time we were at war with Communists in Korea, the No. 1 recipient of our foreign aid—England—was using our aid to finance her trade in essential war materials with Chinese Communists. Britain has continued this policy ever since.

The billions which Americans have poured into Israel turned out to be aid to Soviet Russia.

Now our tremendous foreign aid to France has been explained on the basis that France is the keystone nation of our NATO defense of Western Europe.

But France has not been using our help to build up NATO. France has been using our economic aid to suppress rebellion in her north African colonies.

We have given more than \$4 billion of aid to the African and Middle Eastern nations which now hate us because of our help to Israel, France, and England, and those reports come through now everywhere.

So it goes and has been going all over the world. It will so continue to go until this colossal folly is ended in its entirety.

Now in this connection I wish to quote briefly from Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana. Senator Ellender as late as February of this year had this to say concerning foreign aid after traveling 7,500 miles and 'making' on-the-spot inspections in 28 countries.

Unless United States spending for armaments and aid are reduced, this country will be brought to financial ruin and thus left ripe for the influx of and capture by foreign isms.

Now that is how foreign aid is protecting us from the danger of communism.

Further, what is the opinion in even the countries receiving this so-called aid? The foreign staff of the Chicago Tribune met in conference in London last year. The Paris bureau chief was asked:

What about the American foreign aid program? Do you think it is necessary?

He replied:

Emphatically, no, and it's not just my opinion, either. I have talked with scores of American officials employed here by the United States Government in various organs which handle foreign aid, and virtually everyone has admitted, privately and confidentially, that it is rightly called Operation Rathpole.

"But don't quote me," they say, "or I would be out in the street tomorrow."

General Eisenhower lived in France for several years, State Secretary Dulles has made countless trips to Europe, the Government has Ambassadors, consuls, special agents, and missionaries all over the place, but none have chosen to see the uselessness of the giveaway policy. Newspapers and magazines in Europe certainly give them the facts, if they will read them, as in the recent article in the French weekly, *Paris-Match*, entitled "Why Americans are despised in Europe." They went into the matter in great detail.

Governments, officially, welcome these billions of American gift dollars because the money helps their budgets without resorting to taxation. They are naturally willing that the American taxpayer should shoulder this burden.

Why, then, is it continued?

Well, there are plenty of so-called Americans in high places that have plenty of reasons to like foreign aid.

Mr. Dan Sweet, author and publisher of Dallas, Tex., who is an expert on foreign aid, if there is one, expresses it in this manner:

When they parrot President Eisenhower's argument that giving foreign aid promotes "our own enlightened self-interest," they really mean it.

For several years now, thousands of baffled and burdened American taxpayers have been saying:

"Every way you look at it, foreign aid appears to be ridiculous, unconstitutional, harmful, and wrong. But surely there is something good in it, because all of the Nation's top leaders are for it."

How many influential Americans are making money and acquiring power through America's foreign-aid programs?

How many labor leaders want foreign-aid programs because the Government spending which these programs necessitate puts the Government in virtual control

of key industries? Haven't most of our top labor bosses clearly revealed that they want Government domination of industry, knowing that industry under political control is susceptible to the powerful political influence which the labor bosses can exert?

How many businesses want foreign aid to continue, even while knowing it is wrong, merely because foreign-aid buying brings them lush Government contracts?

How many thousands of Government officials and miscellaneous Government employees use their influence to perpetuate our foreign-aid programs because the programs provide them with pleasant jobs, foreign travel, good pay, influence, and prestige?

FOREIGN AID ILLEGAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL

I assert that the whole foreign aid giveaway has no legal basis whatever. It is based wholly on usurped power. No power was ever granted to the Federal Government to levy taxes on the citizens of this country to aid and assist foreign governments or foreign countries. That right may exist in countries where the inhabitants are slaves and subjects, but not in a constitutional republic such as ours. Powers not granted to the Federal Government are reserved to the states or to the people. The power to tax for the benefit and aid of any foreign nation was never granted or even inferred in the United States Constitution.

Further, it has always been recognized in this country that "Taxation without representation is tyranny." What representation do we have in any one of the multitude of governments receiving our foreign aid? Why we can't even mention or express a hope as to how it will be spent without creating a charge that we are interfering in the domestic affairs of the nation in question.

It is worthy of note that the Federal Government has no scruples in telling any one of the sovereign states of the United States what they must do or not do in order to qualify for so-called Federal aid. No scruples whatever seem to exist when it comes to dominating and dictating to state governments. This is mentioned only to point up the contrast.

In fact, the complete absence of representation in the governments that we are called on to support should be enough in and of itself to bring this illegal exploitation to an end.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT NOT CREATED AS A CHARITABLE ORGANIZATION

But our Government was not set up as any kind of charitable organization or global police agency. Our Federal Government was organized for the purpose of securing "the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

It cannot discharge that responsibility by perpetually sending our soldiers and our goods all over the globe to save the world for democracy, or to guarantee the four freedoms for all humanity, or to save the free world from communism. Continuing our present policy of international meddling is the surest way to plunge our Nation into the total socialism that is communism.

We hear a great deal about the shrinking modern world; the world has grown so small that a toothache in Timbuktu can be felt on the sidewalks of New York; hunger pangs in India cause pain in California.

We have been persuaded that poverty, disease, illiteracy, and international misunderstanding are the real causes of war, and if we don't

help to eradicate these real causes, wars will keep occurring, and every war will inevitably, quickly spread to our shores, because the world has grown so small.

I am weak and weary of these small-world arguments.

In the first place, wars are not caused by poverty, disease, illiteracy, and lack of international understanding. How could there possibly be two nations which understood each other better; which had a more closely similar cultural and racial heritage, which had more nearly identical forms of government, and which come closer to having the same level of prosperity and literacy than Germany and England at the outbreak of World War I?

Wars are caused by tyrants and ambitious politicians playing the dangerous game of international power politics—not by hungry and ignorant people. Hence, our foreign aid does not fight the real causes of war; it feeds them.

In the second place, the world has not shrunk an inch since 1789. It is true that man can today circle the globe in less time than a farmer once needed for a trip into town to buy groceries.

But that doesn't eliminate the need for national defense; it intensifies the need.

The internationalist, one-small-worlders have one argument calculated to end all argument on the question of whether America could once again return to political isolationism; the foreign policy which America followed with remarkable success for over a century.

It is the argument of fear; in the shrunken world of today, no nation is beyond the reach of any other; a reckless drunk in the Kremlin, triggering a bombing raid on America, could have his intercontinental bombers and rocket missiles in striking distance of our great cities almost before he could take another drink.

Now, if that hair-raising condition actually exists in the world—and it probably does—wouldn't it be logical for us to bend all our defensive efforts to the task of finding some defense against such sudden, deadly attacks?

Yes; but that is not the logical conclusion which our internationalists draw.

Ever since the postwar development of modern weapons made an alert and continuous continental defense an absolute necessity to national survival, we have been paying much less attention to the defense of our homeland than to defending and supporting foreign nations.

For example, the United States, in cooperation with Canada has, for several years been working on the DEW line—the distant early warning line—of radar stations stretching across the frozen wastes of northern Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Potentially, this chain of radar stations could be a perpetual, ever-watchful warning system which would instantly detect the approach of enemy aircraft and alert Canadian and American defenses.

Obviously, this is a sensible and vitally important defensive project made possible by friendly international cooperation between two nations. It does not commit us to meddle in Canadian affairs, or them to meddle in ours. It is genuine mutual defense.

But this project (until recently, at least) has been treated like a stepchild. The DEW line is still incomplete.

Why?

Well, it is a very expensive project; and we simply haven't had the funds for it.

We have had enough money to maintain 400,000 American troops in Europe where they would be useless for the defense of their homeland if America were attacked. We have managed to raise upward of \$15 million a year as our contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program, for such interesting projects as teaching tomato raising to the Burmese (who hate tomatoes), and showing butchers in Haiti how to skin cows.

We can build irrigation systems in Pakistan, highways in Jordan, and factories in Communist Yugoslavia; but when it comes to genuine continental defense that costs a lot of money, there is just so much money to go around; and there are so many other places for it to go around in.

An eager-beaver has been described as a man, who, when he loses sight of his objectives, redoubles his efforts.

That, apparently, is what we are now doing; redoubling our efforts.

The topsy-turvy events in the Middle East have brought us face-to-face with the grim truth that our Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson-Eisenhower-Dulles program of aiding and managing the world has been a preposterous failure.

But our chosen leaders simply cannot face up to the truth. There has been much knitting of brows and shaking of heads over the question of what we can do now in the Middle East.

Why don't we just quit giving aid to both sides, disentangle ourselves from the mess, and look to our own defenses?

There is no power, or combination of powers, on earth that could seriously menace the security of this mighty Nation of ours if we would just defend it and leave other people the task of defending theirs.

In conclusion, I wish to urge and recommend on behalf of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., as well as on my own behalf, that this committee find and report that the solvency and the enlightened interest of our beloved country requires that foreign aid be brought to an end now.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. McCormick.

Is there anybody else who wants to be heard?

If not, I want to express appreciation to the folks of this area here in Kansas City for this opportunity to spend the day with you and to hear your ideas regarding our mutual security program.

We have today heard 17 witnesses. The committee has made no effort at selecting those witnesses. We have had 13 of them who have supported the foreign-aid program, 4 of them have opposed it. Percentage-wise that is approximately 24 percent has been against foreign aid, 76 percent has favored it.

Again I express my appreciation.

Mr. Merrow, would you like to speak for the other side of the table just before we adjourn?

Mr. MERROW. I would be very happy to speak for the other side of the table.

I want to join you, Mr. Chairman, in expressing my appreciation for the splendid hospitality we have received in Kansas City and in expressing appreciation to all of those who have cooperated in making this hearing possible today. We have had a fine hearing. I think that it has been eminently successful. We are very happy that we

had the first hearing of the series, Mr. Chairman, in New Hampshire. We have now had hearings in St. Louis and Kansas City, and they have been very successful. We certainly have enjoyed the hospitality; you have a great State, and I hope we get back sometime in the near future.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you.

Any comment from the other members of the committee?

If not, the committee will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:00 p. m., the committee adjourned, subject to call of the chair.)

(Additional statements for the record follow:)

711 BRYANT BUILDING, KANSAS CITY, MO.,
April 29, 1957.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,

*Chairman, Committee on International Relations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: It was a great pleasure to sit with you and visit during breakfast this morning.

For the convenience of your committee, my views regarding aid to foreign peoples can be summarized briefly:

1. We must do much more in the future (several times as much) and keep it up consistently over an indefinite period.

2. Use it where needed—wherever it will help people help themselves—no military alliance nor ideological tests.

3. When possible, make it available through multilateral cooperative procedures, preferably through the U. N.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. AMICK, C. L. U.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN G. L. DOWGRAY, JR., ON BEHALF OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY-DISCUSSION GROUP, WORLD AFFAIRS ARE YOUR AFFAIRS, SPONSORED BY THE CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTER, THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS CITY, EVENING DIVISION, KANSAS CITY, MO., SUBMITTED BY MISS DOROTHY R. WILSON, CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS CITY

At the conclusion of a series of 11 sessions during which the major areas of the world were studied and discussed in relation to United States foreign policy, the views of the participants concerning foreign aid were correlated. Fourteen representative citizens participated in this discussion group including housewives, businessmen, educators, lawyers, a retired Army colonel, and an employee of the Federal Government. On behalf of the participants I am authorized to state as follows:

1. That the foreign-aid program should be supported as an integral part of our foreign policy as a means of safeguarding the security of the United States and our democratic way of life, of raising the standard of living, of developing the economic strength of the less developed countries, and of achieving permanent world peace.

2. That military assistance and the economic assistance given to countries with which we have military agreements should be separated and a single economic-assistance program developed, administered solely by one agency.

3. That more emphasis should be placed on giving economic and technical aid on a multilateral basis through such organizations as the United Nations and the Organization of American States in order to combat the anti-American sentiment and fear of a great world power which exists in many of the less-developed countries of the world.

4. That economic assistance should be made on a loan basis, wherever possible, in order to encourage sound economic policies. Technical cooperation, the joint participation in projects initiated by the recipient countries, should be continued on a grant basis. Exigencies of the situation may require that grants be made for such purposes as disaster relief or in the case where loan assistance would damage the international debt structure.

5. That the large majority of the participants agreed that nonmilitary assistance should be on a long-term basis in order to insure continuity to development programs. A small but vigorous dissent was of the opinion that even this type

of aid should be on a short-term basis so that the need for aid can be reexamined at frequent intervals.

6. That a substantial reduction in appropriations for foreign aid would be detrimental to our interests. Note was taken of the report made by the National Planning Association for the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate in which it was stated that—

"* * * the costs of the foreign-aid programs seen in the perspective of the economy as a whole have been relatively small. Since 1948, the average share of our gross national product which has gone for foreign aid has been 1.7 percent" (U. S. Congress, Senate. Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, The Foreign Aid Programs and the United States Economy, March 1957. Committee print, 85th Cong. 1st sess., p. 1).

And concluded (p. 2 supra):

"Assuming a gross national production level by 1965 of \$565 billion (in 1955 prices), the United States could double the present size of the foreign-aid program by then with little additional impact on the United States economy."

7. That international trade is beneficial to the United States since it helps to utilize scarce resources efficiently, to maximize output, to increase the range of available products, and to sustain high levels of income and employment. Therefore, multilateral negotiations should be continued to reduce tariffs and other governmentally imposed barriers to international trade.

8. That the United States should accept membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation in order to administer effectively the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade as well as to provide effective liaison with contracting parties to the European Common Market Treaty.

636 SOUTH 28TH STREET,
Lincoln, Nebr., April 30, 1957.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: Because I had to be in school April 29, I could not come to Kansas City and state an opinion to your Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, I feel that this letter to you and to your committee may serve as a substitute.

Right now you are probably wondering what an 18-year-old student would mean by making statements to his Government. I am happy to tell you my reasons.

In a year, or possibly less, I will be somewhere on this globe in the service of the United States Navy. It isn't that I want to go, but, that I must fulfill the obligations I owe to the Navy in accordance with the Reserve Act of 1955. At the present time, I am finishing my first year at the University of Nebraska, and in this institute of higher learning, I have come to ask myself:

"Why? Why all this useless bloodshed? Why pit neighbor against neighbor, nation against nation, father against son? Aren't we creatures capable of reason? Can't we find a way to live in peace and end all war?"

Many a pessimist has said: "Peace! Why should I preach peace when there is no peace." In a sense he is right. There has been no peace in all the recorded history of man. From Egypt to Persia, to Cathay and Rome it is the same; "wars to end all wars" or ones that will bring an everlasting peace. These attempts all failed, failed because they practiced ruthlessness and subversion and treachery. But, at last, here in America, a force has been founded, not by the forged chains and shackles of slavery nor the blood of innocent victims poured upon an altar of hate and intolerance, but by the courage and foresight of an industrious freedom-loving people.

Today, it is America that frames the fate of the modern world, not a group of men in the Kremlin, nor a tyrant in Cairo, nor an elderly gentleman in Parliament, nor the National Assembly. The world knows this to be true and the Soviets also. And surely, somewhere deep in the heart of every American citizen, we must know it too.

With all the power of the atom at our disposal, with the raw materials of a thousand planets of a thousand solar systems lying at our feet waiting for us to develop them, we cannot, we dare not, let this chance for mankind to lift himself above that black level of medieval superstition go by. America stands on the brink of things far greater than man's mind could ever perceive. Should we fail, should we shut the door to this "miracle from heaven," we are shutting the door to all

hope of survival. For with the door shut, not even the holiest of holy could survive the "reign of terror" that would follow.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1942, said:

"You know the road which has led you to the Solomon Islands, or to the Red Sea, or to the coast of France, is in fact an extension of Main Street; and when you fight anywhere along that road, you are fighting in the defense of your homes, your own free schools, your own churches, your own ideals.

"We must maintain the offensive against evil in all its forms. We must work and we must fight to insure that our children shall have and shall enjoy in peace their inalienable rights to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, freedom from fear. Only on those bold terms can this total war result in total victory."

Today, our Government has lost that total victory. Perhaps we lost it with Roosevelt's death. Perhaps we tried to regain it in Korea. As I write this letter, there are those behind the Iron Curtain who would prefer death by a firing squad than a life of slavery and degradation under Communist tyranny.

There are several things I feel we must do:

1. America must assume the leadership of the world. I don't mean a world where the Stars and Stripes must fly from every flagstaff in every nation, but a world where the industrial capacity, the science and technology and the agricultural aspects of American life may be applied to the different nations of the world in order that their standard of living might be raised to that of ours. Under strong United States leadership we could see the fall of political, social, and cultural barriers to world peace. The end of all imperialistic groups, the end of social discrimination among races and creeds and the free interchanging of peoples ideas, their music and their cultures.

2. America must present to the world a true picture of what she is. Not just as the savior of western nations from communism and fascism, but as an example by which small and large nations can grow and expand at home by use of the materials they have available.

Show the world how Iowa depends on steel from Indiana, how Florida uses the wood of Maine to build her homes, how the skyscrapers in Chicago, Detroit, and New York would not be standing if it weren't for the cement that comes from Oregon. Show the world how, just as each State depends upon one another, so must each nation if the world is to be in harmony and there is to be a peace, a true peace.

3. She must initiate the settling of world disputes; she must force disputes to a conclusive, welcomed decision. In the Suez, Israel, Kashmir, Germany, Formosa, Algeria, Central America, and many other spots, we have been prone, too many times, to sit back and let events work themselves out. It proved a near disaster in 1917, 1941, and almost so in 1950.

But, in 1950, we acted. We stood off the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Union. And why not now, when war threatens in the Middle East, use a doctrine that was drawn up to disperse war in that area. The Middle East, once the cradle of civilization, lies sleeping under the sun. We must water the desert so as to bring forth harvests of grains and fruits to the cities there, that we might destroy the instability that holds the area in its grasp.

We never acted in Hungary, or China, or in Egypt today. We have taken the atomic question to the United Nations and have pledged to defend the free nations of the world. But is this all that we should or shouldn't have done? After all, isn't Hungary, China, Egypt, the United Nations, and the atomic question all an extension of Main Street? If these nations and ideas aren't born of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear, then our victory, no matter how total it is, is a hollow victory, void of all human dignity.

"* * * Give me your tired, your poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.

Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

These were not just words to look at and admire, but words to live by. We must act and act now, or like the democratic republic of Czechoslovakia, face total defeat from within by forces hostile to the American way of life and the freedoms it possesses.

Sincerely yours,

WM. P. HUNT.

9425 NELSON LANE, BETHEL, KANS.,
May 1, 1957.

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that you are the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Relations. Therefore I want to go on record with you as being opposed to the continuing money that is being spent on foreign aid. I am firmly convinced that we can use this money to a much greater advantage at home and with a great deal better results.

There have been several articles in different magazines of late concerning how our money is being spent abroad and the ones who are advocating even greater spending in the future. I will only cite one article here, but you have no doubt read others yourself. This article appears in the American Legion magazine for May 1957. It is called Bleeding Ourselves White. One place in this article states that Senator Jacob Javits' brother, Benjamin A. Javits, is head of the World Development Corp. He made the statement that we should spend \$2 trillion in the next 10 or 15 years to help the rest of the world. I would like to know here and now if the corporation is sponsored by our Government and supported by the people.

If the company is supported by us, I want to put in a vote right now to abolish this company immediately and any more that advocate such stupid squandering of our money. I for one will look to your committee to see that this sort of thing is stopped as of now.

Please see that this sort of thing is brought under control during this session of Congress before we all will have to go on relief in this country. Then what do you think would happen? You know as well as I do.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. TURNER.

STATEMENT OF MRS. SELMA C. UHLMANN, KANSAS CITY, MO.

I wish to protest against the recent policies and actions of the State Department of the United States of America, which policies and actions to my way of thinking are not only confused and confusing, but dishonest. These policies and actions I believe are leading not only to the loss of allies and friends, but even to war. I will refer in this statement to one particular incident, which I regard as especially wrong.

My name is Selma C. Uhlmann. I am one of a fourth generation Missouri family, traditionally Republican, born and reared in Kansas City; with 2 sons, both volunteers in World War II; and 5 grandchildren, born and being reared in Kansas City. I am the wife of Paul Uhlmann, president of the Standard Milling Co.

My husband and I understand a little of the Middle East situation; firstly, through two visits to Israel and secondly, through over 20 years of participation in aid to Jewish refugees.

Though we deeply regretted the Sinai campaign, we understood from having seen it ourselves, the dire peril and need for protection of the Israelis from day after day theft, murder, and constant threats of invasion.

So when in February the President of the United States addressed, over television, the people of this country on this question, we turned to him for guidance and help. With gratitude and hope we heard him make a pledge to do his utmost to restore justice and peace to this region, if the armed forces were withdrawn from the Sinai Peninsula. We understood that he made no definite pledge to cure everything but, at least, that he would do his utmost to help in some way. He spoke with what we felt was deep sincerity.

We felt that he understood that the Suez is not a Jewish problem but an international one, that the Israelis were entitled to protect their homes and boundaries, and that the right of innocent passage through the Gulf of Aqaba was legal and just. We believed he meant what he said.

So we wired Ben-Gurion urging him to trust the United States, its President, and its people and to withdraw from Gaza and the entire peninsula. We also wired the President of the United States that we had done so.

About March the 9th, a vessel with a cargo of oil under the American flag was sent to the Port of Elath. We have been informed (through the newspapers) that was done by agreement between Mr. Herter, Under Secretary of State, and the Israeli Ambassador.

To many people in the United States and certainly to the Israelis this meant that the United States was implementing its promise to help establish justice in this region. To many people everywhere it meant that the United States Government was doing what it said it would do in a legitimate, safe, and inexpensive way. Evidently the State Department was afraid it might be so construed.

About a week or 10 days later a press statement was issued by Mr. Lincoln White that it meant no such thing and had no bearing on the right of innocent passage.

What are our friends, our allies, and our enemies to think of such actions? Will they not judge us to be uncertain in our policies, weak, dishonest, and disloyal to all we have always defended in our past?

POST OFFICE BOX 1092, KANSAS CITY, MO.,
April 29, 1957.

Representative A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Attached copy of a letter to a grandson is sent to you for what value it may have, if any. It would have been presented to your committee in Kansas City today but your time was more than taken up and it was thought that it would have been an imposition to have done so. If listening to such an amount of testimony is normal procedure for you gentlemen, then possibly you are yet not paid enough.

This letter, attached, was written by a man who spent 5½ years overseas in 2 wars and several years at other times, and has formed opinions while there as to the world situation. The time spent abroad was not as a tourist but on personal business, that is, other than wartime.

Your truly,

R. E. WYNANT.

(The letter referred to above follows:)

DEAR GRANDSON: So your public speaking class will debate what is usually referred to as "foreign aid." It is a subject to which more Americans, both in and out of Congress, should give much more study and thought. To many, the only interest seems to be the immediate pocketbook effect. That is partly human nature. There is, however, much more to it than that. Even a few years in foreign countries drives some facts home very forcefully.

Much has appeared in the press and been said on the air regarding this subject. As you know, my only direct connection with it is the same as most Americans—help pay for it. Of interest to all of us is why, who, how, where, when, cost, results obtained, and those that can be reasonably expected.

What would seem to be the sensible policy in a situation such as this? In your town, the population is in four blocks. In your block is a large percentage of the wealth, accumulated by those families living there for several generations. The other end of town was taken over by a gang whose life has been getting and keeping what they want by murder, by slavery for all who oppose them, and whose avowed goal, as proven by words and acts, is rule of the entire town. The two blocks between contain the balance of power.

Would you cultivate to the fullest extent those who live in the two center blocks? If past relations between you, your immediate friendly neighbors, and them had not always been all that could be desired, would that stop you? If recent and even present efforts on your part seem to have not been very successful, would you, in view of the stakes, stop there? If some had agreed to be on your side since they believed that their own best interests required it, would you be sure they had adequate means of defense? Would you provide weapons? If they needed food, clothing, and other things to keep up their desire to defend themselves, to have something to live and fight for, would you provide such things?

What would seem a sensible policy toward those who have not agreed to be on either side? Would you try to convince them that you are the ones to best help them keep their freedom, their self-respects and attain economic betterment? Would you expect to do this by dictation? Would you try to tell them how to conduct their personal affairs? If they needed assistance that it was in your power to give, would you provide it? And remember the balance of power is in them as a whole, the largest part of that whole you must have, if not for you, at least not against you.

Even a casual reading of the papers shows that to be the world situation today. The administration that we have elected to handle international policy knows the situation and that is why they are asking the citizens of the United States to support the present policy.

There are some who say instead the money should be spent at home. They say—think of all the schools, roads, hospitals it would build; think how much taxes could be reduced so individuals could buy more of the things they want. If these same people were confronted by a long and costly illness by a member of their family, would they withhold treatment to use the money to buy things they want for themselves, or to save it? If spending to save the health of a member of their family is right, and of course, it is, is saving the health of their country less so? Some situations that confront us in our lives are not to our liking but if they exist, they cannot simply be swept under the rug. They must be faced.

Some say we simply cannot afford it. The total amount proposed in the budget averages less than \$2 per month per person in the United States. If military and defense support items are taken from the total, then that amount is less than 30 cents per person per month. If the Armed Forces of those on our side are not maintained, you know whose manpower will and must supply the deficit.

Some say that while it is true that we are not at war, no one can prove that foreign aid had anything to do with it. That is correct. It is also correct to say that no one can prove that it did not have much to do with it, in fact that it was not the deciding factor.

Some say that at least part of the money has been unwisely spent; at times even wasted. Probably true, and certainly that needs correcting to the fullest possible extent. Of how many businesses in the United States can it be truthfully said there is no waste? How much spent on research in this country provides no tangible result? Should business or research be stopped for that reason? Certainly not. Instead of halting foreign aid, which in fact is self-help, we should do as a business does, more Americans whose know-how could make it more productive should make their services available.

There are those who say you cannot buy friends, and they refer to such things as signs painted on walls saying "Americans go home." I have seen such signs, and know those responsible for them were the people whose aims were hindered by American friendship. Friendship of a person or a nation that can be bought for so much a degree is worthless. It is also true that sincere friendship can be gained by being helpful and sincerely interested in other peoples problems—even if it costs some money. If spending in an effort to gain friends is unproductive, then business should stop doing it for those they want or have as customers or whose assistance they need in other fields. Even Members of Congress might try spending nothing to influence votes. Some refer to foreign aid as "giveaways" or other nations getting something from us for nothing. Is it considered a give-away for a business to contribute to a hospital fund, a united campaign fund, universities, or scholarships? No; it is good business in their own self-interest. If that is true of a business, if it is good community relations for them, why then is this not true of a nation, especially the one that, like it or not, is in a position of leadership in the community of nations.

Others say attention should not be given to this or that nation because we don't like their government or some things they do. Certainly this is true of those who are our enemies. We are not trying to cultivate them but protect ourselves from them. We cannot, at least under present conditions, expect their friendship. It is moreover not sensible for anyone to expect friendship of a nation or a person if we demand that they pattern their lives to please us and abandon customs, traditions, religions, or other things that have been their way of life for generations. At least until we can show them something that they themselves believe better. In any nation regardless of how it got there, the government is in control. If we want that nation's friendship, we cannot expect to get very far, at least in most cases, by antagonizing the government. The question there is how much we need that nation's goodwill, and what are the prospects of persuading that government to cooperate.

Others say, what about all this money being spent on the Armed Forces? That is to defend this Nation. Why do we need this foreign aid business in addition? True the Armed Forces are to defend this country. Did anyone ever know any time when they were called upon, however, that many thousands already under arms were not killed and many other thousands as well? The way to keep a bully from starting a fight is to convince him he would lose. The odds must be against him, and remember the balance of power lies in the people in the two center blocks, the nations whose friendship we need.

It has been said that have-not nations have nothing to lose so make raids on our Treasury by acting like they might become allies of communism. Well, if we do not have enough sense to evaluate a situation, what might and what might not happen and the extent to which it concerns us, then we have deteriorated to such a degree our cause is hopeless anyway. Are we so helpless, so lacking in intelligence that we cannot determine what calculated risk it is to our advantage to take and act accordingly? While no one in either business or foreign affairs can be always correct, to do nothing produces nothing. Regardless of statements by some politicians, this country's record has not been bad and there is no reason to believe it will be. The people in foreign affairs of this Nation are just as intelligent and dedicated as any of us, and usually have much more experience in their field and know more about it than most of their critics.

Some say why should we pay it all? We don't by any means. The tax rates of most of our principal allies are higher than ours, in some cases over twice as much.

Others say it could be better handled by private business. Why does any business exist? To make money, of course. If they fail to do that for any considerable length of time, they quit. If private business alone could accomplish what our foreign assistance is trying to do and has a chance to do, why is that not a matter of history. Were there large foreign investments in China? Private business alone cannot do the job. In some places it could help, depending on what it tries to do and how it does it. In some places at times the native resources and population have been exploited, in some instances shamefully for profit. Businesses that do that don't create goodwill in a foreign country any more than they do in America. The object of the program usually referred to as foreign aid is to make and keep friends. Would these be the prime objectives of an American business in a foreign country?

In short it boils down to this—are we ready for a saving of less than an average of \$2 per month per person to increase the risk of the balance of power going to those whose avowed purpose is to give us the Hungary treatment, when by spending those dollars, there is at least a chance that it will not do so. Of course, no one can prove that spending this money will avoid war—also they cannot prove that it will not. It is our decision to make. Anyone can sidestep his responsibility for helping to call the shot. No one can sidestep the result.

Yes, it is more than our duty as a citizen, it is of vital importance to all of us to give this subject some serious thought, and make a decision that is not influenced by those who have an ax to grind.

If anything in this letter will help you in your debate, you are welcome to it.

X